

The Forum

NOVEMBER, 1896.

“AS MAINE GOES, SO GOES THE UNION.”

SINCE 1840 the results of the elections in the State of Maine have been anticipated with intense interest, because they were thought to indicate the trend of public sentiment throughout the United States. Until after 1880 they were followed by the elections in Ohio and Indiana, which, in the public mind, determined the ultimate issue. Since that time Ohio and Indiana have joined the States holding elections in November, and the effect has been to still further increase the anxiety with which the results in Maine are everywhere looked forward to. “As Maine goes, so goes the Union” has not always been true; but so correct has it usually been in its indication of the final event that confidence in the general truth of the saying has suffered little diminution from the exceptions.

The effect of the Maine election is twofold: it serves as an indication, and its influence is considerable. If Maine goes Republican by a strong majority it encourages that party, and proportionately disheartens the Democrats. The election in Oregon comes too early to be much of an indication, for in April the issues of the campaign are not so sharply defined in the public mind that the declaration then made can have any great force. This very year, for example, when the Oregon election took place there was not even a reasonable probability that silver would become the paramount issue. Vermont, under all circumstances,—at least within any reasonable memory,—has been so steadfastly opposed to the Democratic party under all the varying phases of its existence

Copyright, 1895, by the Forum Publishing Company.

Permission to re-publish articles is reserved.

that no one expects or even dreams of a change. The action of Vermont, therefore, is always forecast and creates but little change in the popular estimate of future results. But in Maine the contest is always a warm one; the battle is well fought; and there are real reasons—aside from the mere time of the election—why that State should indicate what the results will be in the other States. The election, while early, is seldom so early that the national issues have not become well defined and, consequently, the permanent issues of the campaign.

The voters in Maine, while they do not have the advantage of the very latest discussions and the most recent facts and figures bearing upon the questions to be decided, have advantages which are very great. All the country being interested in the Maine election the most strenuous efforts are put forth. The best speakers are secured, as, August and the first part of September being too early for campaigning in the other States, men of ability, standing, and national reputation are able to give their assistance in Maine. In times past we have had Wade and Banks, Benjamin and Howell Cobb, Garfield, Harrison, Morton of Indiana, Allison, Ingersoll, Emory A. Storrs, and hundreds of men of like eminence, until it came to be a byword that no Maine School District would look at any less person than a United States Senator, and not even at him unless his oratorical powers justified the partiality of his constituency. Nor were there wanting at times some elements of discussion unusual in New England: as when Mr. Blaine debated the questions of the day, now with one Democratic leader and now with another, upon the same platform. Mr. Blaine's high standing in the party enabled him to command the services of the ablest men, and in every campaign which he conducted the issues received full discussion and complete elucidation.

For more than fifty years this full discussion by strong men has been going on in Maine, giving the people rare opportunities of becoming acquainted with the principles of government and with practical and sensible politics. In the files of the "Portland Advertiser" for 1840 there can still be found a speech delivered from the steps of the old City Hall by Sargent S. Prentiss,—a son of Maine of whom the State is still proud,—which, in vigor and power as well as in light banter and in severe reproach, would to-day hold an audience as it held that before which it was spoken for three hours on a summer evening nearly sixty years ago. Stump oratory generally has greatly improved since then, but Prentiss would carry with him the multitude of to-day as he did his audiences of 1840.

It is sometimes the fashion to sneer at stump oratory, and before we get to the end of this campaign we shall doubtless have had such a surfeit of it that we shall have much sympathy with the sneerers; but it cannot be doubted that the meeting of great bodies of speakers with the people throughout the country has a wonderful influence. The effect of the printed word is great, and by the aid of the newspapers it has the tremendous advantage of daily iteration; but when speech-making begins, its power is felt from one end of the country to the other. There is something in the presence of the man—talking and looking you in the face—that makes what he says effective beyond the printed word, no matter how often reiterated. In the Greeley campaign, before the speech-making began, the tide of public feeling seemed to be running against Gen. Grant and the Republican party; but, after the first fortnight of speech-making, the tide visibly turned, and the result was as surely indicated as it was by the elections in Maine and the October States.

Maine, therefore, has had the advantage for many years of a good political education; consequently, when new questions arise her voters are ready to grapple with them, and to give in September a judgment as mature as can be rendered in November by the rest of the Union.

It is true there have been seeming exceptions to the impression which seems to be established in the public mind, that Maine is a fair index of what the country will do; but if each of these exceptions be carefully analyzed it will be found not to disprove the popular idea. In 1880 Maine went against us: the country elected Garfield President, notwithstanding. In fact our elections that year gave the country such a shock that our party was probably saved by it. We had been so long in power that our own people had an idea that we reigned by divine right; whereas, in fact, we were really on the edge of defeat without the country meaning it or knowing it.

This disaster in Maine had a twofold cause neither part of which was national. We were that year cut off by local circumstances from the general feeling and were not so situated as to indicate the sentiment of the whole country: we only indicated our own state of mind. The Greenback wave had passed over us in 1878, followed by what was called the "State Steal,"—a series of frauds so appalling that we could not denounce them strongly enough. As we made little distinction between those who were innocent and those who were guilty we maddened the innocent without frightening the guilty, and Gen. Plaisted was made Governor of a State we thought our own. In

November, however, when we were in some small degree emancipated from the effect of these local causes, we carried the State for Garfield.

In 1884 the State declared for Blaine by 20,000 majority. Since McKane's conviction, however, there cannot be much doubt as to where the vote of New York should have gone; so the vote of Maine in 1884 was not an exception to the rule. In 1890 also we carried the State by figures which gave no indication of the result in the country. We re-elected our Members of Congress by increased majorities and yet were overwhelmingly beaten at the general election, the country giving us an overthrow in the House of Representatives,—a defeat which was, at that time, unequalled in our history. The election of 1894, however, placed our opponents in a worse position even than that. But the election in Maine in 1890 was held, for once, before the issues had really become settled. The election was early in September, and the McKinley bill was not passed until the middle of October. That campaign was entirely without parallel. The House of Representatives, by the acts of its own party in the Senate, was held in session the whole season long, and we had no time in the campaign to explain or defend what we had done; for, by reason of this very detention, the campaign was too short. We had been sacrificed to silver.

This year of our Lord 1896 Maine was in a fair condition to represent as usual the feeling of the people of the United States. We had the issues fully discussed by both sides, though I am bound to admit that the silver side was not presented by very able advocates. Mr. Bryan, after his New York experience, decided not to come, and most of the gentlemen who did come were but little known. A similar lack of eminent and able speakers seems likely to prevail through the country generally, either from the fact that the silver cause fails to enlist able service, or because all the well-known Democratic leaders are in hot opposition to the Chicago Convention.

The Chicago Democrats were also troubled—though not so greatly as might have been supposed—by the fact that their candidate for Governor had been nominated on a gold platform and was a gold man. Consequently there was a condition of things which required a new alignment. A new candidate had to be nominated: a new platform had to be made. As similar embarrassments seem to have existed all over the country we may fairly conclude that in this respect we only represented the average condition of things elsewhere. At first there was some fear in the State that the Silverites had made progress. Declarations, both public and private, to that effect were very common;

but when that progress was carefully noted it was found to be confined to the Democratic ranks. Many Democrats, it appeared, had, in obedience to the behest of the Convention of their party, surrendered their temporary allegiance to sound money, and had declared in favor of silver. It became equally well known by the same process of observation that many Democrats were still true to the platform established before Mr. Bryan's nomination; hence they could not be reckoned upon to vote the regular ticket and to endorse the new faith. In the Republican ranks there were no defections. The problem then arose, What will these sound-money Democrats do? Will they be carried away by party allegiance, and vote as usual? Will they stay at home, or will they make their views effectual by voting for the Republican candidates? Arguing in the parlor, at home, and away from the polls,—especially arguing for another man,—it seemed very clear that a vote for the opposite party was the only way to express the true sentiments which these men felt. But in real life it is tolerably hard to refuse to vote with your party. All your ties are there. Most of your friends are there. If you are an old man and have always stood firm, it is very, very hard to change the record. It is also a shade harder for a Democrat than for anyone else. Many Democrats have followed their party through pretty hard places, through some good and much evil report, so that it seemed like treachery to friends of long standing to leave them for even one election. Many men passed through the ordeal bravely, and deserve more credit than they will ever get. Many whose belief was just as firm stayed at home. The result all the world knows.

Even when comparison is made with 1894, when the people were simply indignant and there was no Presidential result hanging upon the question then to be determined, it will be found that the Republican candidate gained 13,444 votes more than his predecessor; while the Democratic candidate received an increase of less than 4,000,—this under all the stress of the Presidential year and of a Vice-Presidential candidature from the very State. The plurality in 1894 was 39,827; this year it was 48,377. But if the comparison is made with the last Presidential year, namely, 1892, the results are startling. The Republicans had nearly 15,000 votes more than in 1892, and the Democrats, about 21,000 less. In that year we had 12,522 plurality; in this, 49,000. In 1884, when Mr. Blaine was the candidate for the Presidency and every nerve was strained, we had 20,000 plurality; this year, when the election was distinctly on the silver issue,—with

due understanding however that the Republican party is for protection,—we had 49,000 plurality.

Surely this cannot fail to be an indication of what the country intends to do in November. The same causes must operate everywhere and must produce similar results.

While, as we go West, there are more Republicans who are known in a general way to be friendly to silver, there has really been very little disposition toward the coinage of silver at 16 to 1, free and unlimited. Outside the silver-mining States there has been only a vague feeling of willingness to do something for silver, without much idea of what that something should be. The truth is, we have tried all the "somethings" which have been suggested, and the full discussion now taking place will show that, of all the indescribable somethings for silver, the proposition before the people at this present election is the worst. It seems on the whole, however, fortunate for the country that we are having this battle and this settlement. For many years the Republican party has been at great disadvantage because of its silver advocates. Six years ago the alliance between the silver men and Mr. Gorman, representing the South, caused us a bitter defeat at the polls. In the last Congress the honest effort made by the Republican House to pass a revenue bill which would have gone a great way to revive business, and which would have helped the Republican Administration very much on its accession to power, was doomed to death by the very men whose States owed their admission to our efforts and who owed their own places to our votes. This bill, so essential to the welfare of the country, was deliberately sacrificed by silver representatives, who hoped that out of added confusion and sore distress this country would buy redemption by some other sacrifice of its better judgment. It is well therefore that the question should be fought out; and the sincere hope of every believer in upright government is that the victory may be so decisive that the Senate shall no longer refuse to represent the wishes of the American people.

We all hope the day will soon come when the States which are disproportionately represented in the Senate may have behind their Senators the teeming populations which their resourceful lands can so easily sustain. Meanwhile it is much to be desired that the power which these Senators now have may be used with some regard to the wishes of the entire people of the United States.

THOMAS B. REED.

THE "SOLID SOUTH" DISSOLVING.

THE Presidential campaign just closing has had many striking features, but none which is of greater significance than its demonstration that we no longer have a "Solid South." How great and important a change this is appears only when one reflects that for twenty years no real doubt has existed as to the way the electoral votes would be cast in all the sixteen States in which slavery formerly existed. In other words, an entire section of the country has for a fifth of a century been solidified in support of one and the same party, and the candidate of that party has had there assured three fourths of the votes that were required to give him a majority in the Electoral College.

Nothing more abnormal could be imagined than the virtual unanimity of political opinion in two fifths of the States of the Union during so long a period. In every nation with a representative form of government two great parties have divided men. One of these parties might always be exceptionally strong in some section, but even then the opposition would include a goodly share of the intelligence of the community. The unprecedented feature of the Southern situation during the past twenty years has been the fact that practically all the education and property has been ranged on one side.

Originally the South was as much divided in political opinion as the North. There were as bitter controversies over the ratification of the Constitution in one section as in the other. When Federalist and Anti-Federalist passed from the stage, and new issues arose, men were still as far from being unanimous in the South as in the North. When Andrew Jackson was elected President in 1828, Kentucky cast 31,460 votes for John Quincy Adams, the New Englander, as against 39,397 for the "favorite son" of its next-door neighbor, Tennessee. Maryland gave Adams a majority, while Delaware chose a legislature which gave him her electoral votes, and in Louisiana the contest between the two candidates was a close one. When "Old Hickory" came up for reelection in 1832, Henry Clay, his only serious opponent, carried as many slave States as free; Delaware, Maryland, and Kentucky sup-

porting him in the South, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut in the North.

Sixty years ago there were thirteen slave States, Florida being still a Territory, Texas a part of Mexico, and West Virginia included in "the Old Dominion." In the Presidential election of 1836 South Carolina, as always until the civil war, chose Presidential electors by the legislature, but all the rest by popular vote. It is a remarkable fact that Martin Van Buren, the Democratic nominee, polled, in the aggregate, almost precisely the same number of ballots in the South as were given to William Henry Harrison and Hugh L. White, the candidates supported by the Whigs, the respective totals being 212,283 and 212,668. Delaware went against Jackson's protégé, as it had gone against Jackson himself each time that he ran. Maryland gave Harrison a majority of 3,684, and Kentucky, 3,662. White had a majority of 10,039 in his own State of Tennessee, and of 2,772 in Georgia. Van Buren carried Louisiana by a majority of only 270, Mississippi by 291, and Arkansas by 1,162. In the remaining four Southern States his majorities ranged between 3,284 in North Carolina and 6,793 in Virginia.

The Whigs twice carried a Presidential election—in 1840, and again in 1848. Each time their candidate had a majority in eight of the Southern States, which numbered thirteen in the first contest and fifteen in the second, through the admission in the interval of Florida and Texas. Half a century ago, therefore, the South divided in politics after a perfectly normal fashion. The fact that a State was a part of that section signified nothing as to its being for either party. Thus, in 1848, Maryland went for Zachary Taylor, the Whig candidate; Virginia for Lewis Cass, the Democratic nominee; North Carolina for Taylor, South Carolina for Cass, Georgia for Taylor, Alabama for Cass, Florida for Taylor, Mississippi for Cass, Louisiana for Taylor, Texas for Cass. Most of the Southern States were so evenly divided that each party could contest them with a fair chance of success; the majorities in neither Delaware, Alabama, nor Mississippi reaching 900, while in Virginia, Florida, and Arkansas they were below 1,800. In short, the political conditions throughout this section were such as are to be expected when two parties appeal for support.

Slavery changed all this. As the "peculiar institution" came to be the dominant issue, self-interest steadily operated to bring the voters of the South together into one party devoted to the cause of slavery. The organization which came into existence during the 'fifties to op-

pose the extension of slavery could not secure even a foothold in that part of the country. Neither Fremont in 1856, nor Lincoln in 1860, received a vote between the Potomac and Ohio rivers on the north and the Rio Grande on the south, save a few hundreds in Kentucky and Virginia in 1856, and less than 2,000 in each State in 1860. Despite the Democratic split in the latter year, the South was solid in opposition to the party which had swept the North. In 1848 Vermont and Massachusetts cast their electoral votes for the same Presidential candidate as North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana. Twelve years later nobody in these latter States would have had the courage to propose putting in the field the ticket which received the overwhelming support of New England.

Slavery was abolished by the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, five years after Lincoln's election in 1860, but its influence upon the political attitude of the South has survived for a period covering the lifetime of a generation. Through the enfranchisement of the late slaves and the disfranchisement of many of their former owners, the party which had no existence in the South in 1860 established temporary control over nearly all the States in that section. The freedmen had been given the ballot by the Republicans with the expectation that they would always use it for the benefit of the party which had given it, and that only a small white contingent in addition would be required to constitute a majority in almost every State. Shrewd politicians fancied that they had thus insured the dominant party an indefinite lease of power in that section, and, by consequence, in the nation.

When even South Carolina gave a large majority for Grant in 1868, it looked to the casual observer as though the scheme might prove successful. But in a very few years the Republican managers discovered that they had been living in a fool's paradise. Although the natural leaders of the Southern whites had been largely disfranchised for their course during the war, the demand for amnesty was too strong to be resisted, and it was not long before they enjoyed their old rights and resumed their old prominence. These leaders had been Democrats before the war, because Democracy stood for the maintenance of slavery; and they were still more inclined to Democracy after the war, because the Republican party then stood not merely for opposition to slavery or even for its abolition, but also for the much more hateful policy of making the former slaves the rulers of those who had been their masters.

The blacks largely outnumbered the whites in South Carolina and Mississippi, were as numerous in Louisiana, and constituted almost half the population in several other States. They were as anxious to vote the Republican ticket at every opportunity as had been expected. A small element of the native whites, and another white element composed of "carpet-baggers" from the North, were ready to organize the black vote into a solid mass. Such a combination seemed, theoretically, invincible at the polls, and, consequently, certain to control the section. But practice soon set theory at defiance. That happened which anybody familiar with either human nature or human history should have expected. The whites simply refused to submit to the rule of the blacks. It made no difference if the blacks were in a large majority, as in South Carolina and Mississippi. When the issue was made one between races, the superior race soon won the victory over the inferior, without regard to their relative numbers. Intimidation kept so many of the blacks from the polls, and fraud cheated so many of those who persisted in going there, that the returns showed a majority for the candidates of the white minority even in Mississippi as early as 1875. By 1876, or within ten years after the blacks had been given the suffrage with the expectation that they would make the South permanently Republican, that section was practically solid for the Democratic party. South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana were, to be sure, counted for the Republican candidate in the Presidential contest of 1876 between Tilden and Hayes, but Hayes surrendered the control of all three States to the whites almost as soon as he had been installed in the White House.

Theorists had supposed that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution would suffice to secure to the freedmen untrammelled exercise of the suffrage. As soon as it became evident that the matter was not settled by their ratification, a demand arose for the "appropriate legislation" to enforce their provisions, which Congress had been given the power to enact. The Republican national platform of 1872 declared that "the recent Amendments to the national Constitution should be cordially sustained because they are right, not merely tolerated because they are law, and should be carried out according to their spirit by appropriate legislation, the enforcement of which can safely be entrusted only to the party that secured these Amendments." The platform of 1876 declared it "the solemn obligation of the legislative and executive departments of the Government to put into immediate and vigorous exercise all their constitutional powers

for removing any just causes of discontent on the part of any class, and for securing to every American citizen complete liberty and exact equality in the exercise of all civil, political, and public rights." Such a resolution came to be considered a necessary plank in every Republican national platform. The Convention of 1880 stated that "the equal, steady, and complete enforcement of laws, and the protection of all our citizens in the enjoyment of all privileges and immunities guaranteed by the Constitution, are the first duties of the nation"; and, after a reference to "the dangers of a Solid South," declared that "the honest voter must be protected against terrorism, violence, or fraud." The Convention of 1884 pledged to the Republicans of the South "our most earnest efforts to promote the passage of such legislation as will secure to every citizen, of whatever race and color, the full and complete recognition, possession, and exercise of all civil and political rights."

The so-called Federal election laws, enacted more than a quarter of a century ago, were the first response to the demand for legislation to enforce the Constitutional Amendments. They represented an attempt on the part of Congress to regulate elections in the South through supervision by Federal officials, who were to secure the blacks "a free ballot and a fair count"—to quote a phrase for a long time in vogue in Republican parlance—and were to punish through the Federal courts those whites who should deny the negroes a fair opportunity to register and to cast their ballots. The "tidal wave" in the Congressional elections of 1874 gave the Democrats a majority in the House of Representatives, for the first time since the ante-bellum period. No sooner did the Republicans see power in the national Capitol thus slipping from their grasp than the more radical among them, under the lead of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, attempted to fortify the position still left them by the passage of what came to be known as the "Force Bill." This was a measure designed greatly to extend the powers of the Federal Government over elections in the Southern States; and it was so extreme that the more liberal element in the party revolted against it, and delayed its passage through the House until so late in the session that the Democrats in the Senate could easily smother it there.

Nothing could have been devised better calculated to keep the South solid than the threat of Force-Bill legislation, and this threat was held over it for many years. Meanwhile enough attempts to enforce existing laws regarding elections in that section were made to harass the whites without benefiting the blacks. In the long run no laws, Federal, State, or Municipal, can be enforced in any locality in

which they are not sustained by the public sentiment of that locality. There was nowhere in the South any pronounced sentiment in favor of supervision of elections by officials appointed from Washington. Such interference would have been resented in the North. It was most odious to the whites of the South, because it was exercised in behalf of the blacks and was designed to help the latter to outvote the whites and control the States. It was rendered the more intolerable by the fact that the supervisors and deputy marshals employed were often men justly obnoxious to the communities in which they served.

Six years passed after the failure of the first Force Bill before the Republicans recovered control of the House through the Congressional elections of 1882. Even then they did not have a working majority in the Senate, and no attempt was made to pass anything in the nature of sectional legislation. Again did the Republicans go six years without controlling the House, but when they once more secured it, through the elections of 1888, they captured the Senate and the Presidency also. The party could now, therefore, formulate a policy which it might expect to enact into law and then to enforce. The two chief features of this policy were a high-tariff bill and a Force Bill. Of the two, President Harrison was perhaps the more earnestly devoted to the latter. The platform adopted by the National Convention of 1888, upon which he had been elected, explicitly committed the party to such legislation by a resolution which "reaffirmed unswerving devotion to the personal rights and liberties of citizens in all the States and Territories in the Union, and especially to the supreme and sovereign right of every lawful citizen, rich or poor, native or foreign-born, white or black, to cast one free ballot in public elections, and to have that ballot duly counted," and proceeded as follows:—

"We hold the free and honest popular ballot, and the just and equal representation of all the people, to be the foundation of our Republican Government, and demand effective legislation to secure the integrity and purity of elections, which are the fountains of public authority."

This was universally understood to mean a demand for a Force Bill, and a desperate attempt was made by the Harrison Administration to redeem the party's pledge. No serious difficulty was experienced in pushing through the House the measure that was framed, although discussion revealed the existence of opposition to the policy among Republican members from the South. But the bill stuck in the Senate at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, and was finally shelved by that body during the second session, after the coun-

try had pronounced overwhelmingly against the Republican party in the Congressional elections of 1890. Thus for the second time the South had a narrow escape from the actual enactment of a most objectionable law. But the threat of a Force Bill still survived. The Republican National Convention of 1892 renominated the President who had strained every nerve to secure the passage in the Senate of the House bill of 1890, and it adopted a platform which declared that "the party will never relax its efforts until the integrity of the ballot and the purity of elections shall be fully guaranteed and protected in every State"—a declaration which was universally understood to mean that, if the Republicans should again be given full control of the Government, a Force Bill would be passed and put into effect.

The Democrats were only too glad to meet this issue, and they held their opponents to it. A long and elaborate plank in their national platform of 1892 was devoted to "the policy of Federal control of elections to which the Republican party has committed itself." This policy was declared to be "fraught with the greatest dangers," and to be one which "strikes at the North as well as the South, and injures the colored citizen even more than the white." The resolution expressed the "belief that the preservation of Republican government in the United States is dependent upon the defeat of this policy of legalized force and fraud," and proceeded to "pledge the Democratic party, if it be intrusted with power, to the defeat of the Force Bill." This was the first time that the issue had been distinctly made between the two parties in a Presidential contest. The original attempt to pass a Force Bill early in 1875 was not included in the indictment of the Republican party which the Democrats framed in their national platform of 1876, reported by Lieut.-Gov. Dorsheimer of New York, and representing the plan of campaign formulated by Samuel J. Tilden, the Presidential candidate; consequently, the policy was not clearly at issue between the two parties in that year.

No doubt was left as to the verdict of the nation upon this question in 1892. The tariff was indisputably the dominant issue in the campaign, and the result was, first of all, a decision in favor of greater freedom of trade. But the sectional question was also much discussed, especially in the South, and it was an important consideration in the minds of many voters when deciding how they would cast their ballots. This was particularly true of some regions in the South where the recent development of industrial enterprises had inclined the people to look upon protection with more than the traditional de-

gree of favor. It was Harrison, the personification of the Force-Bill policy, who was defeated, almost as much as Harrison, the representative of McKinleyism.

Whatever may be the final verdict of history upon the second Cleveland Administration, we can already see that it will be credited with one beneficent achievement of epochal importance. Its Tariff Act will, of course, be repealed or amended, sooner or later. By this time everybody realizes the truth of Lincoln's allusion, in 1860, to "the old question of tariff—a matter that will remain one of the chief affairs of national housekeeping to all time." But one act to which Mr. Cleveland has set his signature will stand as a landmark in our national history. That is the act to repeal the Federal election laws, by which all those statutes that gave the General Government power to interfere with elections in the States were swept away. This was the final elimination of the slavery issue from our politics, and it ended an era in American history. It was a step forward in our national progress, which needed to be taken, but which the Republican party could not take, because the record of that party required it to claim—however reluctantly—that it was a step backward.

In truth the opposition of the Republicans in Congress to the repeal was only perfunctory, while many of the wiser party-leaders outside Congress at heart welcomed it. Even in 1890 there had been Republicans in each branch of Congress who were not afraid to denounce the Force Bill. The Democrats were thus enabled in their national platform of 1892 to characterize it as "a measure deliberately and justly described by a leading Republican Senator as 'the most infamous bill that ever crossed the threshold of the Senate.'" This Senator was Mr. Teller of Colorado, who has recently left his party on the silver issue, and his attitude toward the Force Bill was rendered somewhat questionable by the appearance of a "trade" between Republican Senators from the mining States and Democratic Senators from the South, to secure the shelving of the sectional bill in return for help in passing a free-coinage bill. But no such suspicion had attached to the opposition of Representatives Ewart of North Carolina and Coleman of Louisiana.

Both these Congressmen were native Southerners of Confederate antecedents, Mr. Coleman having served in the army on that side, as Mr. Ewart would also have done but for his youth. They belonged to the comparatively small class of such men who embraced the Republican cause after the war, and who by their ability and character commanded

the respect of the great mass of the whites who abominated their politics. There could not be better judges as to the effect of a Force Bill than such Southern Republican Congressmen. Both of them condemned the measure as sectional and as certain to work only harm to the section for which it was designed, by creating trouble between the races, in which the blacks would fare the worst, and by solidifying the white vote, which seemed on the eve of disintegration. Mr. Ewart concluded his speech with this manly statement of his own position:—

"I do not know what course other Southern Republican Representatives may take in this matter; but, speaking for myself, I will never by my vote or voice support a proposition that tends to humiliate or degrade my people. I shall, if I am the only Republican on this floor, protest against the passage of a law that will sow the foul seeds of factional discord among the people, and be a fruitful cause of unutterable woe to the unfortunate class it is designed to benefit. If that be treason to the party to which I have ever been loyal, make the most of it."

The Federal election laws were repealed in February, 1894, and the effect was plainly visible in the elections of the following November. The Republicans carried Missouri for the first time since 1868, when many thousands of Democrats were still disfranchised. They carried Tennessee for the first time since reconstruction days (except once when a Democratic split gave them the victory), their candidate for Governor having a small majority of the votes cast, although the Democratic legislature refused to seat him. They swept all four congressional districts in West Virginia, which had been Democratic for more than twenty years. With the help of the Populists they carried the State ticket and the legislature in North Carolina against the Democrats, for the first time since the reconstruction era.

Another twelvemonth showed still more clearly the change in political conditions wrought by the elimination of the sectional issue. Maryland and Kentucky had been slave States, and had opposed the party which abolished slavery, so long as any trace of the slavery issue survived. The negro element was comparatively small in these old border States, but the feeling against the "Radicals" for their policy of disfranchisement had been almost as strong and lasting in Maryland as in South Carolina. In 1895 each of these "sure Democratic" States, for the first time in its history, elected a Republican Governor by a good majority in the heaviest vote ever polled.

The general reaction against the Democrats as the dominant party, which followed the panic of 1893 and the hard times that ensued,

was an important element in the overturnings in these Southern States. But that reaction alone would not have given the Republicans victory if the old slavery issue had enabled the Democrats to draw the race line as clearly as before. In both Maryland and Kentucky last year Republican Governors were elected only by the help of many thousands of men who had previously always voted the Democratic ticket. If 4,500 such sound-money Democrats in Kentucky had supported the free-coinage Democratic candidate, the revolution would not have occurred. The reason for Democrats voting according to their convictions on the financial question, instead of "standing together" on the race and sectional issues which had grown out of slavery, was that the Federal election laws had been repealed and a Force Bill was no longer threatened. Proof of this is found in the fact that the Democratic candidate and other campaigners in Kentucky made desperate attempts to solidify the party by appeals of the old kind, which had always proved effective, but were now received with indifference.

The election laws having been repealed, the question for the Republican party was no longer whether it should sustain a policy which it had initiated and championed for a quarter of a century, but whether it should advocate the revival of a policy which had been done away with. All that was necessary to be rid of the matter was—to say nothing more about it. Thoughtful Republicans had long doubted the wisdom of trying to do anything more for the blacks through legislation, and they were quite ready to accept the advice of such authorities as Congressmen Ewart and Coleman. While philosophers and philanthropists had lost their faith in legislation as a help to the negro, practical politicians had at last become convinced that there was "nothing in it" for the Republican party. They had hardly passed the original laws in order to establish absolutely their control of the South before that section had escaped from their grasp. They had never started a movement for a Force Bill without injury to their own party. On the other hand, they found the repeal of the laws welcomed by the Republicans of the South, as giving them an opportunity to make headway among the whites of that section. Most impressive of all, they saw the first elections after the repeal in several Southern States resulting in Republican victories, which the Democrats themselves admitted were due to the loss of the rallying cry by which so long as a Force Bill was threatened they had always been able to weld the whites together.

The first indication of the changed attitude of the Republican party was afforded only a few weeks after the passage of the repeal measure,

when the Congressional Convention in the fourteenth Missouri district adopted a platform endorsing the action—a platform on which the Republicans carried the district, then represented by a Democrat. By December, 1894, the drift of party sentiment toward acceptance, and even welcome, of the repeal was so strong that a Republican Congressman from New England, who had himself voted for the Force Bill of 1890, declared that "there will not be three men in the next Congress (and I do not believe there will be one) who will any sooner propose to enact any kind of a national election law than they would propose to put the national troops at the points in the South from which they were removed by President Hayes in 1877." This forecast was fully justified by the event. Not a single voice has been raised in Congress in favor of enacting new election laws since the repeal of the old ones.

The issue thus recognized to be dead has been buried by the formal action of the Republican party this year. Not a Convention for the choice of delegates to the National Convention in any one of the forty-five States said a word in favor of Federal election laws; while the Texas Convention, composed largely of colored delegates, adopted a resolution declaring that "we view with satisfaction and pride the rapid growth of Republican sentiment in the South; and, relying on the force of a healthy public opinion demanding fair and honest elections, believe that further legislation on this subject by Congress is undesirable and unnecessary." The National Convention reflected the feeling which had pervaded the State gatherings, and absolutely ignored the pledge contained in the platform of 1892 that "the party will never relax its efforts" to this end. Finally, the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1896, who was "the leader of the House" in 1890 when that body passed the Force Bill, put into his letter of acceptance a passage which is virtually a recantation of the sectional views that he used to hold, and a promise that he will lend no countenance to any attempt at such legislation in the future.

North and South alike recognize that no resurrection is possible for this issue. After the Democrats recovered control, several Southern States changed the time for choosing State officers to some other month than November and incurred the trouble and expense of a separate election solely in order to avoid the presence at the polls of Federal officials, who could attend only when Congressmen were to be chosen. In the October following the repeal of the election laws the Democratic Governor of Georgia told the legislature that the State suffered from

the frequency of elections, and that "there no longer exists sufficient cause for the separation of national and State elections." The following spring the Florida legislature voted to submit to the people this year an amendment to the Constitution abandoning the separate State election in October, and consolidating it with the national election in November. The popular discussion of this proposition developed scarcely any opposition, the fear of a Force Bill having almost vanished.

Most important development of all, several Southern States are doubtful in the Presidential election. In more than one which the Democrats have always carried since the slavery issue became acute forty years ago (*except during the war and under the abnormal conditions of the reconstruction era*), the chances seem to be in favor of the Republicans. In short, we have witnessed this year, for the first time in nearly half a century, a Presidential campaign in which there has been an approach in the South to that normal division of opinion on public questions which should always exist among intelligent men in every community. Great wrongs are still to be righted in that part of the country, and grave problems yet remain to be worked out by Time, but the outlook for its future was never so promising as now, when the "Solid South" is dissolving.

EDWARD P. CLARK.

CONDITIONS FOR A SOUND FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

DURING the ages when the earth was supposed to be flat mankind became accustomed to the danger of falling over the edge and so paid but little heed to that danger. When this same earth was found to be round it was not the weakness of the evidence which made the discovery unpopular, but the fact that the people did not know how to get along with it in its new shape. The danger of getting on the under side and pitching headlong into space was too awful. Humanity had not yet learned that truth is never experimental, that law is regnant and harmonious; nor have we yet learned it, except in theory.

Science is knowledge of law, and there is no inexact science because there is no inexact law. Whenever the science of Money shall be written it will be found in perfect harmony with all other truth; that is to say, with all other facts and with all correct ethical laws. It will not be popular, because we have lived so long under the rule of thumb and built so many dykes to hedge in the floods of error that we shall at the outset resent the smooth flow of a scientific system which will leave our dykes in plain view as mere rubbish. We have worked too hard on them to give them up easily. Nevertheless, truth claims all things for its own, and time will surely perfect the title. The sooner we accept this fact, the sooner life will be relieved of unnecessary friction and we shall have more time to devote to other things.

The first step in building a scientific structure is to find a working hypothesis. This must agree with all known facts or admitted truths, for, if inconsistent with any fact, it is not tenable. If, however, time shall prove that hypothesis to be in harmony with all facts, it is no longer a hypothesis but an exact science. In the search for a working hypothesis on which to found the science of Money, perhaps the natural method is to note the points at which we are now out of harmony with law, and then to seek for that which will avoid these errors.

I. VOLUME OF MONEY.

I think it will not be easy for the student of the future to repress a smile when he reads the history of the nineteenth century and discov-

ers that learned men seriously discussed the question, "How much money *per capita* ought to be in circulation among the people?" His vision being clarified, so that he will not look upon a due-bill or an evidence of debt or a "promise to pay" in any form as money, he may be pardoned the smile. He will read how a great nation, waging a gigantic war, with an empty treasury, unable to meet its expenses with ready cash, found a patriotic people ready to supply its needs and accept its promises for future payment to an unlimited extent, and he will admire that patriotism; but he will wonder how it came about that afterward, when the Government found itself in funds, the people who held its notes objected to having them paid, on the ground that it would result in "contraction of the currency." It is certain that only the antiquary of the future will find any meaning in the phrase quoted. Assuming that some grave professor shall be able to explain it all, will not that same student wonder why a people, ingenious enough to augment a short supply of money by substituting therefor mere evidences of debt, and to curtail a long supply by refusing to coin one of its money metals, was not able to increase its crop of sugar or decrease an excessive crop of cotton by the same factitious methods?

There can be but one measure to the volume of money, just as there can be but one measure to the volume of wheat, corn, cotton, or any other commodity: that measure is the exact amount in existence and possession. There can be but one excuse for the existence of a note, and that is the inability of a debtor to pay in spot cash.

There is no commodity in this wide, wide world which animal life cannot dispense with and continue existence. (Water is a commodity only when it is produced by labor and exchanged for value, and need not be considered.) For everything a substitute can be found, and therefore the value of every commodity is determined by the measure of its convenience to the human race. The measure of that convenience is in turn made up of the superior utility of that commodity itself over any substitute, plus the labor of producing the substitute.

A correct understanding of the law of supply and demand is the key to many problems financial and commercial. Such understanding is by no means universal. Let me state it in the simplest possible terms. The more a person has of anything, the more of that thing he will give for some other thing which he desires. This is the law of supply. The law of demand is, the more a person desires a thing, the more he will give of what he has in possession for it.

If any reader shall look upon these two propositions as being the

same, then his understanding is vague. The distinction is not at all subtle. It is, however, practically one law, for both sides are always represented in any transaction. A clear comprehension of this law easily settles such heresies as that of money being a thing of fixed value while all other values fluctuate; or, that money is a fiat of law and may consist of anything regardless of intrinsic value; or, that gold and silver have no intrinsic value, all value being given to them by the statute which makes them money; or, that money is not a commodity.

To illustrate the law of comparative values, let us suppose that at a given time all the commodities that enter into our commercial life are in exact normal supply; that is to say, they exist in such quantities as are the result of average agricultural, manufacturing, and mining conditions and activities. This exact normal supply will carry with it an exact normal demand at all points. Now let us suppose that a considerable portion of some one commodity be suddenly destroyed. This article will immediately become dear as related to every other article. Again, let us suppose that, while the relations of other things are undisturbed, a greatly increased production of some one thing occurs. That commodity will become cheap relatively to all other commodities; and the phenomenon is the same in either case, whether the commodity be money or shoe-pegs. What then is the ultimate unit of value? Evidently not money; for it fluctuates with supply and demand as readily as eggs. The day's labor? Hardly. One man works all day throwing stones over a fence, only to find that they are more in the way than before; another makes a machine that the next day and all days thereafter will do the work of a dozen men.

Let us cease to search for what does not exist. All values are relative, and all values fluctuate with supply and demand. There is no ultimate unit on this side of the wall that bounds space.

Gold and silver are commodities because they are produced by labor and exchanged for value. The mint performs no service other than putting the commodities into convenient parcels for the uses of commerce. The only reason why this service should be performed by civilized governments instead of by individuals is, that each parcel carries in its mint-stamp an absolute guarantee of weight and fineness, so that it does not need to be weighed or assayed each time it changes hands, as would be the case if it were coined by a less responsible party; a fine mint-stamp having the added advantage that loss by abrasion or defacement is easily detected.

Money is intrinsically valuable, just as a railroad, a ship, a wagon,

or a wheelbarrow is intrinsically valuable, and for precisely the same reason ; namely, because it saves time and trouble in the exchange of commodities. If some better method of effecting exchanges than by the use of money shall ever be devised, then money may become valueless ; similarly, if some better methods of transportation (only another name for "effecting exchanges ") shall be devised, then the railroad and the ship will retire from the volume of the world's assets.

The exact normal value of any commodity is fixed by an exact knowledge of the amount of that commodity available for use, and of the amount of it required for use. It is for this reason that so much labor is bestowed on the statistics of production and consumption of the world's principal commodities. Any deception practised upon the commercial world in these matters is looked upon as little less than criminal. Let us suppose, for instance, that the owners of the great elevators should band together and issue certificates for two bushels of wheat for each one that is received in store. Assuming that this piece of rascality should pass undiscovered, it is only a modern schoolboy's problem to forecast the result. Wheat would fall far below its normal value because of the apparent over-supply ; it would be lavishly consumed ; everybody would be bountifully fed ; and everybody, except the wheat-grower, would be happy. At this point let the bogus certificates be retired, leaving only those outstanding which represent actual wheat. The real supply is found to be short,—much short of what it would have been but for the excessive consumption ; famine is in the land ; and the people curse the men who deceived them into folly. Would anybody be ass enough to demand a re-issue of the bogus certificates in order to feed the people ? Not at all. The plain remedy is to produce more wheat. But when it happens to be a question of money instead of wheat—although the commercial principle is precisely the same—the ass-market is in long supply.

Ever since the enormous issue of "demand" and "indefinite" notes from 1861 to 1863, the country has been flooded with something which has masqueraded as money, but which is not money ; things which are evidences of debt, instead of things with which debts can properly be paid. Every tyro in finance understands that the day has come when this bogus money should be retired. The debts which they represent must be paid. This does not mean "contraction of the currency," but a reduction of this long inflation and a realizing sense of true conditions. Try as we will, we cannot make money out of paper any more than we can make wheat out of the same material. We can

keep on our course of self-deception for a time longer perhaps, and suffer the consequences; or we can face the fact now, that we have not money enough, and supply the deficiency by producing more. We shall find abundant use for all our money metals, of which a false conception of the money supply has caused us to export in the past ten years the enormous sum of \$450,000,000. Our supply of money is not sufficient for domestic needs; and, with a full knowledge of the economic facts, we should find no surplus for export for many years to come.

Surely it would be a waste of words to discuss the subject of "fiat" money, with the experience of the Confederate States fresh in our memories. Money (so called) was plentiful enough, and the source of supply practically inexhaustible. Everything that money could be exchanged for was dear enough, but still the people did not enjoy that heaven of prosperity which the advocate of fiat money thinks ought to prevail under like conditions. It is not worth while to theorize when a fact which exactly fills the niche is ready to hand.

II. FREE COINAGE.

Free coinage is an ethical error founded on a false idea of the functions of the Government in connection therewith.

The Constitution of the United States (Art. I, sec. 8) gives Congress the power to "coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin." There was no need of a constitutional provision to give Congress the power to coin money; and as for the balance of the clause Congress might just as well have been granted the power to "regulate" the snow-fall of the Sierra Nevadas. Anybody can coin money. The only difference between money coined by the Government and that coined by John Doe or Richard Roe is, that the former gives a guarantee of weight and fineness that is accepted the world over, while these perhaps very respectable private individuals can not. A thousand acts of Congress can not weigh a hair in regulating its value. It takes the whole commercial world to do that; and no one individual can be more than an infinitesimal factor in the operation. In the old days when it was treason to "mutilate the King's head" there was something of sovereignty in the mint-stamp, but that has all passed away simultaneously with the doctrine, *Dei gratia Rex*. There is no "hoodoo" in the mint. It simply puts the miner's metal into merchantable parcels and passes it back to him to trade with as he best can; and there is no more valid reason why the miner's product should be put into convenient

parcels free of charge than that the farmer's cotton should be put into bales in like manner. The work is done for the benefit of the owner of the metal; and if it is not worth to him the cost of doing it let him trade with his native metal as he best can. There is sufficient public utility in it to justify doing the work at actual cost, but not more. Free coinage is plainly a tax on all the people for the benefit of a few. Let us have no more of it.

III. RATIO OF VALUES.

It may be accepted as an economic axiom that two products which vary from time to time in relative cost of production, cannot be held to a fixed ratio of value. This is the Law of Omnipotence and yet there are men (with little sense) who propose to override it by a statute, and other men (with sense enough to know better) who propose to override it by a series of statutes called "international agreement." A very strong man may carry a very heavy weight so long as to mislead a child or an idiot into the belief that he can do it always. The weight may be divided among several strong men and so carried for a very long time, but gravity will prevail at last. The onlooker, with a streak of indolence traversing his body, only wonders why the load is not dropped on the ground at the outset. Any attempt to fix a permanent ratio of value between gold and silver is in the nature of a burden. This Government has stood under it until it can carry no more, and we now seek relief by a division of the burden. Why do we wish the load carried at all? That we are sustaining all that we can carry was amply demonstrated by the panic of '93, the real cause of which appeared in the fact that the Government was issuing more promises to pay *on demand* (in the continued coinage of silver dollars) than its credit would sustain. It was called in derision a banker's panic, and that was true, although the derision was ill-placed. The country is deeply indebted to the astute bankers who succeeded in calling a halt to this financial anarchy before it became quite ruinous.

I do not wish to thrash over old straw in order to demonstrate that it is not the metal or the mint-stamp, but an act of Congress, which holds the silver dollar to a parity with the gold dollar. It is imperative, however, to impress on the mind the full meaning of the "act of Congress." Its virtue lies in its implied promise to *redeem*, and, without that obligation, that same act of Congress could not hold one silver dollar for one minute to a parity with gold. Put into plain English, therefore, the Government of the United States promises to pay to the

holder of each silver dollar one hundred cents, on the return of the fifty-three cents which he has in hand.

I can take a horseshoe to any store in this, my residence city, and purchase therewith a thousand dollars' worth of any goods in the store, giving a written agreement to redeem the horseshoe within a reasonable time with one thousand dollars lawful money of the United States. Even a tramp would not go gathering horseshoes on the strength of my deal; yet the purchase with a horseshoe and a purchase with a silver dollar differ only in degree, not at all in kind.

That which is necessary on the part of this Government, in order to hold a limited quantity of silver to a parity with gold at any fixed ratio, would be necessary on the part of all civilized governments, in order to hold all silver to a similar parity. In other words, all the governments must agree to purchase the world's stock of silver at nearly double its value; or, in still other words, all the people of all the nations must levy upon themselves an enormous tax, in order that the possessors of silver may sell it at double value; and this tax must continue from year to year, so long as the silver-miner lives to vex the bowels of the earth and the people on its surface. It does not need a prophet to foretell that, sooner or later, gravity must prevail.

IV. LEGAL-TENDER LAWS.

Of all the mossy old dykes that have misled the people and delayed the perfect work of error, a legal-tender law is, perhaps, the most objectionable, because the most effective. But for this, we should long ago have been whipped into better things. The very nature of it is either absurd or iniquitous. Any law purporting to bind the citizen to accept as consideration on a contract just the very thing which he agrees to accept is too rankly absurd to find room on the statute-book; and a law which obligates the party to a contract to accept as consideration something other than, and different from, that which he contracts for ought to find no place in the consciences of law-makers. The very existence of the law is an admission that the things which by it are substituted for dollars are not dollars. Given a poison in the stomach, an antidote becomes a good thing, but normal conditions involve the absence of both poison and antidote. It is not denied that the legal-tender law has performed antidotal functions, but this is in itself proof that the system which rendered it efficacious is unscientific, and if we shall fail to dispense with it wholly we shall fail in our search for a tenable working hypothesis.

To summarize :—It seems to be demonstrated that a correct money system must involve the following conditions ; to wit :—

The volume of money must be measured by the exact amount of the money metals in possession and available for that purpose.

That volume must not be increased by the introduction of things which are not money, nor diminished by refusal to coin any money metal on even terms with any other money metal.

There must be no attempt to fix by statute a ratio of value between two different metals.

All mint service should be paid for at the actual cost of such service, and, that being the case, any metal may be coined, the use of which as money is demanded by any considerable portion of the people.

There must be no occasion for a legal-tender law.

To these may be added :—

Our money system must stand upon its own foundation so as to be independent of any action of other nations, and this without disarrangement of international commerce. It must not involve, or even tolerate, a pledge of the Government credit to sustain the value of any commodity whatever ; and it is pertinent to remark here that there is no warrant in the Constitution for such pledges as have already been given.

Two coins which are unlike should not be given the same name in such manner as to lead to confusion of terms ; thus a “dollar” should not be at the same time a gold coin and a silver coin.

Further, as matters of utility but not of necessity, (1) the decimal system should be retained ; and (2) coin—other than fractional—should not be in actual circulation, on account of its inconvenience and the loss by abrasion.

Before any material change in our money system can be made, the exact status of all present indebtedness, both public and private, should be definitively fixed. This will hinge entirely on the interpretation of the term “dollar,” and the only question proper to consider in the matter is, What does the word mean *now* ? It is of no moment what it meant to the Fathers of the Republic. It is not pertinent to discuss how, when, or where any change was made, except as to whether or not it was made by competent authority.

The proposition that all private indebtedness is based upon a dollar of 23.22 grains of pure gold will hardly be disputed, except by those who would dispute anything on the chance of avoiding honest payment ; but it is held by many, and with some show of sincerity, that a

portion of the public debt was contracted when either metal would have been readily accepted in payment, that therefore the option lay with the Government, and that *that option has never been lost*. It is all correct enough except the words in italics, and these are not true. That option has been lost by the pledge of Congress to maintain all dollars to a parity of value. This could only be done by holding the poorer to a level with the best, which is gold. Under this pledge, doubtless every Government obligation in existence has changed hands many times and is now held by innocent purchasers for value.

Whatever *might* have been, that is what *has* been, and it has been done by competent authority. That is why every dollar of Government obligation is a gold dollar, and this rule must include every standard silver dollar that has ever issued from the mint.

Whatever Congress does is the act of the people, and the people are bound by it. Any subsequent discovery that the act was foolish does not release the penalty of the bond.

How, then, shall we place our financial system upon a sound basis?

First fix the value of a dollar by statute past all question and then put the unsightly thing into liquidation. It has always been a rule-of-thumb term, meaning one thing to-day and another to-morrow. It has always been a plaything for money-tinkers, and we have outlived playthings and should no longer be money-tinkers.

Let the standard coins be also standard weights, so as to give them some significance. Let the ounce troy of standard metals be the unit coins and the minor coins be decimals of these.

The gold coins would naturally be the ounce, half, and quarter. The silver coins would be the ounce, half, quarter, and tenth, leaving the token coins as at present which is good enough.

This would give us gold coins about 7 per cent lighter than our present twenty-, ten-, and five-dollar pieces respectively, and silver coins about 16 per cent heavier than those of our present coinage. The terms dime, half-dime, and cent could be retained and the half-cent should be added.

Let it be kept firmly in mind that the office of the Government extends not one hair's breadth beyond receiving the bullion from its owner and passing it back to him in manufactured (coined) condition, deducting therefrom the cost of the service. The Government has no more right to influence the market value of a person's property in gold or silver than it has to manipulate a "corner" in peanuts. In

reality, it is as powerless to do so as it is to give metes and bounds to a water-spout.

The Government should refund every dollar of its present indebtedness in bonds of the new money denominations and at such dates as are consonant with its ability to pay them.

Provide by act of Congress for receiving into the United States Treasury all coin that may be offered (or bullion, after being assayed at the mint) and issuing therefor certificates in such denominations as shall suit the depositor.

Establish in each State a depository at which certificates can be issued or cashed.

Last of all, repeal all legal-tender laws and substitute therefor a provision that, in case United States certificates shall be tendered in payment of any obligation and refused by the payee, all legal proceedings for recovery shall be at the cost of the payee until sufficient time has elapsed to enable the payor to send his certificates to the nearest depository and receive back the money therefor.

We may now consider some of the consequences that would follow the adoption of such a financial system as I have suggested. Unfortunately there are many of us who not only wish to be paid for being good (for that always happens) but we wish to know just what and how much the consideration is to be. What then are we to gain by getting into harmony with law?

First,—An entire cessation of those panics caused by violent fluctuations in the volume of our circulating medium. There could no more be either plethora or stringency in the money-market, but a steady volume that would hold business to a steady level based on perfectly normal conditions.

Second,—Gold would be the money for large transactions and silver for the smaller every-day business of life. Inasmuch as the smaller transactions aggregate much more than the larger ones, and from the further fact that the small transactions call in much larger proportion for the actual money in hand, the demand for silver money would press upon the supply in greater measure than gold, and therefore the relative value of silver would steadily appreciate.

Third,—We should find that the volume of money now in possession is not sufficient to keep up a rapid and easy system of exchanges, and this would give a wonderful stimulus to our mining industries, especially to silver-mining.

Fourth,—As we should have no gold or silver to spare for export, we should pay our bills for imported goods in agricultural or manufactured products. If these should be refused, then we should manufacture the goods which we have heretofore imported; an enormous impetus being given in either case to our home industries.

Fifth,—We should have scarcely any work for our mint except for fractional coin, as the bulk of the money metals could more conveniently be held as bullion.

Sixth and last, so far as it is necessary to enumerate,—Our money system would be so simple and sensible that it would be adopted by other nations and, after an international conference to settle the standard of alloy, the coinage of the world would be interchangeable piece for piece.

The poor, the vicious, the foolish, and the afflicted, we should have with us still, but something of human ills would have been removed.

E. W. CODINGTON.

WOMAN FROM THE STANDPOINT OF A NATURALIST.

“And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee : nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.”—1 Cor. xii. 21.

I HAVE been asked by the editor of *THE FORUM* to write on the zoölogical aspects of female suffrage: a task for which I feel quite incompetent. In fact I doubt whether the subject has any zoölogical aspects, although I suppose I have as much confidence in the virtue of zoölogy as anyone. I believe, however, that the general natural history of the human race, regarded as part of the history of the animal kingdom, makes us acquainted with facts which have important bearings on this and other social problems, although it may give no solution to practical questions.

Some seventeen years ago I published an article on “The Condition of Women from a Zoölogical Point of View,” in which I tried to show that the respective shares of men and women in the intellectual, moral, and social evolution of our race are, like their parts in the reproductive process, complementary to each other; that there can be no question of superiority or inferiority, since both are equally essential to the welfare of society; that one cannot say to the other “I have no need of thee” without injury to both.

As we review the history of the evolution of life we find that at every stage of its progress the welfare and the very existence of each species demand, as the price of success in the struggle for existence, that it hold fast to all that has been gained in the past, and that it also escape from competition by widening the sphere of its activity or by increasing the accuracy and definiteness of its responses to the order of nature within that sphere.

In modern civilization, progress by bodily change has been replaced by progress through education and training and culture, but both the retention of all that has been gained and advancement to higher levels are as essential in the domain of thought and morals as they are where bodily structure is concerned. We may be confident that the human population of the future is to be descended from those families in which, other things being equal, these two things are best

attained; and that families in which they are not attained are, other things being equal, the ones which are destined to be crowded out.

Modern scientific research has given to the very old belief in the continuity of life clearness and definiteness undreamed of by the ancient philosophers. It proves, so far as any negative can be proved by evidence, that there is no point at which the embryo or the germ begins to live, but that life goes on unceasingly from parents to children, generation after generation, in an unbroken chain. While capable of indefinite increase, life is never added to from without. No organism and no germ which has died is ever endowed, in course of nature, with new life. This scientific generalization is quite independent of any opinion as to what life is, for it is founded on observation and not on reasoning.

The life of every being now in existence has flowed on without any break in its continuity by death, and without any interruption,—except the alternation of periods of latency with periods of potency,—for a length of time which, at the least, is estimated by cautious palæontologists at a hundred million years, and there is no reason why the life of some who are now in existence should not continue to flow on just as far into the future.

Duration of life for an indefinite and practically limitless period, with a share in all that the unknown future has in store for the inhabitants of earth, is within the reach of some of us; and, if life be worth living, it would seem to be the greatest of earthly blessings. No matter how great its burdens, life is the sum of all things on earth, for to him who is joined to all the living there is hope. It can, however, fall to the lot of few to be thus joined to all the living, for while many family lines may persist for a few generations, speedy extermination is the destiny of most. Whatever value we may set on this possibility of boundless life, there can be no doubt as to the fate of the exterminated; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun.

Survival in the struggle for existence is the condition on which the possibility of any future share in terrestrial life depends, and while this fact may be ignored by those who despise the things this life can give, all who love life must admit the importance of everything which helps to maintain permanent advantage in this struggle. The price of survival is what students of social science call division of labor, while zoölogists call it divergent specialization.

In the essay above referred to I gave reasons for believing that the intellectual and moral differences between men and women are due to division of labor; that the mind of woman is specialized for the retention of the fruits of the training and culture and education of the past; while the mind of man is specialized for perfecting the correspondence between mind and the order of external nature. I also tried to show that families in which this specialization is most perfect are likely to be the successful ones in the struggle for existence.

Among men, at least, there is pretty general agreement as to the nature of the mental differences between the sexes, although there is great diversity in opinions as to their causes and meaning. Some assert that woman has been "subjected" by man. Some believe one sex is superior to the other; the supposed superiority, often determined by the sex of the speaker, being always measured by the standard which the speaker has in mind. Still others believe that there should be no question of superiority or inferiority, since they are complementary and neither is complete without the other.

Those who hold the last opinion are logically bound, and usually quite ready, to admit, that if, through male selfishness and oppression, or from any other cause, women are hindered from the highest perfection which our times permit, the interest of all, both men and women, demands the removal of this restriction; but one may admit this without admitting that the needs of the two sexes are identical. We must also remember that human progress is slow, and limited by obstacles and lack of opportunity. If women find that they cannot reach their best and most lofty ideals; if they cannot, at once, become all they would like, or have all they want; they are not peculiar in this respect, but are only sharers in the common lot of humanity.

The history of civilization shows that its growth has been attended by slow but steady improvement in the condition of women, and that it may be measured very accurately by this standard. It is often assumed, by those who review this history, that the improvement has been wrung from unwilling men, or granted by generous ones, and that more may be got in the same way. It is also assumed to be not only improvement in the condition of women but progress toward the condition of men, although the one by no means implies the other. I venture to believe that man—the adult male human being—has had little to do with either the "subjection" or the "emancipation" of woman, and that her improvement is only one aspect of that progress of the race in which her share is precisely the same as his.

Primitive man was, no doubt, an ugly, ferocious brute, but there is evidence that primitive woman admired his ferocity and was quite ready to abandon him and follow a more ferocious brute with resignation and even with exultation. If the woman of the heroic age was in constant danger of life-long slavery under covetous and able-bodied neighbors, her men-folk were, according to the "Odyssey," in no less danger of furnishing a bloody meal for dogs. Any delicate and refined woman of to-day would find the common life of a woman of the Dark Ages unendurable. The women of the Dark Ages were not over-refined, nor, for that matter, were those in the time of good Queen Bess; and the life of either of those periods would be misery and wretchedness to the men of the nineteenth century as well as to the women.

Those who talk of the subjection of woman to man's dominion, and her emancipation from his tyranny, forget that, during historical times, the whole human race has improved in the virtues of self-restraint and humanity, and that, even if there has as yet been no material progress in disinterestedness, selfishness has unquestionably become more enlightened and broad-minded. Instead of being something wrested from hard-hearted man, the improvement of the condition of woman is only one aspect of that progress which benefits all,—the young, the mature, the aged, women and men, alike. Man has not deliberately worked out his destiny. He has been shaped and controlled by influences of which he has been, for the most part, totally ignorant; influences which are purely natural, shining like the sun on the evil and the good, and descending like rain on the just and the unjust; and woman, like man, has had her part in the whole history of our race.

While admitting that the average woman may not be the most admirable or the most useful one, men are tolerably unanimous in the opinion that there are well-marked differences between the average male mind and the average female mind. They hold woman superior to man in concrete acquaintance with those principles of conduct which are of most general application, and in constitutional aptitude for applying them to special cases, without deliberation, and, as it were, by instinct; so that she is able to act wisely in the affairs of practical common life without waiting to weigh motives and to compare consequences. In other words woman is held by man to surpass him in intuition.

On the other hand man holds himself superior in power to abstract

and to compare, to deliberate, to suspend judgment, to reach new generalizations by the slow process of logical reasoning, and to perceive these generalizations in their pure and native light, free from all practical complications. By these means he is able to extend the domain of mind over nature and to escape competition by opening new fields for action. He believes he has especial aptitude for winning his way in the field where bold and aggressive qualities count. He takes upon himself the task of challenging competition by striking out into new lines; and he believes he excels woman in power to discern the laws of thought, of society, and of the material universe, and in ability to make these discoveries the basis of conduct, and thus to widen the sphere of human activity. Where intuitions, instincts, emotions, and past experience furnish no guide to conduct, he believes his judgment is better than hers. His power to originate and to generalize from new experiences fits him for success in occupations where competition is fiercest; where marked success depends upon the addition to the knowledge and skill of his rivals of the inventiveness which gives him advantage over them.

If women wish to abandon the domain which he considers more properly their own, and to compete with him, they should have a fair field, but they can expect no favor. If they are driven to the wall they may, if they choose, attribute their "subjection" and his success to his big lungs and muscles, and to his brutal energy of body and mind, rather than to any difference of mental quality,—but the result will be the same.

Competition is only one factor in human progress. Few of our acts meet new conditions. Experience or organic structure has already determined what we should do in all the circumstances which most directly affect our safety and welfare. Here action must usually be too prompt to permit deliberation or reflection. Ability to act promptly in the innumerable exigencies of common life is, at least, as important as ability to extend the field of rational action. Man believes that woman is more richly endowed than he with the instincts, intuitions, habits, and principles which come to us from the past, and he holds that those women who desire independence, and those who are forced to care for themselves, would do well to seek occupations where ready tact and versatility are more valuable than the narrow, technical skill which comes from training,—positions where success does not involve competition with rivals.

The use of both these sides of the human mind is clear, and it

is hard to see how anyone can admit the aggressive superiority of man, and the intuitive superiority of woman, without suspecting that this specialization has a meaning, and without wondering whether it may not exist because of some benefit to the race. It is obvious that the excellence of woman's intuitions fits her to be the intellectual and moral as well as the physical mother of mankind; while man's originality fits him to make a place in the world for his family by surpassing his competitors in the race of life. No one has ever pointed out the nature of the mental differences between men and women more clearly than Mill ("Subjection of Women"), and it is surprising that one who recognizes their use, as he does, should hold that they are not natural. He says:—

"Looking at women as they are known in experience, it may be said of them, with more truth than belongs to most generalizations on the subject, that the general bent of their talents is toward the practical. . . . Hardly anything can be of greater value to a man of theory and speculation, who employs himself, not in collecting materials of knowledge by observation, but in working them up by processes of thought into comprehensive truths of science and laws of conduct, than to carry on his speculations in the companionship, and under the criticism, of a really superior woman. There is nothing comparable to it for keeping his thoughts within the limits of real things, and the actual facts of nature. Woman's thoughts are thus as useful in giving reality to those of thinking men as men's thoughts in giving width and largeness to those of woman."

If the really superior man needs woman to protect him from the eccentricities of genius, to keep him on the track which has terminal facilities, to give "reality" to his thoughts, is he not as subject to her as she is to him? May not that to which there is nothing comparable for a man of speculation, be of use also to a man of action? May it not have wider scope and be of value to humanity as a whole? Play is sweeter than work; to common men as to philosophers. Men are kept at the treadmill by conjugal and parental obligations. If woman has aptitude for holding not only the really superior man but the very common man by the tight rein of stern reality this seems no more than natural, but it is no evidence of inferiority or subjection.

While I cannot agree with Mill that the feminine characteristics which he notes are the result of subjection, I most heartily concur with his opinion on the value of education, and I wish to say a word on the educational aspect of this many-sided question.

We may hold the opinion that the mental differences between men and women are natural without believing that boys and girls differ in

the same way or to the same degree. Zoölogists know that when allied organisms become divergent during their ancestral history the difference is not, as a rule, manifested in the early part of their individual history, and that, when modern, it is not fully established until they reach full maturity. Education commonly means the training of the young; and I know no good ground for believing that the capacity of girls differs materially from that of boys. The modern movement in liberal education for both is unquestionably wise and well-directed, and each community must decide, on practical grounds, whether the obvious advantages of separate schools and colleges overbalance the economy and other well-known advantages of coeducation. The ease with which girls and young women have, during the last few years, emancipated themselves from physical imbecility shows that they have been under no subjection, and that, if they contented themselves in the last generation with slovenly and spasmodic attempts at croquet, this only showed their ignorance of their own capacity. The out-of-door life of modern girls and their energetic participation in sports which give self-reliance, independence, agility, and control of muscles which at one time seemed in danger of atrophy, seems altogether commendable. Those who read the signs of the times see, in their free tread, their erect carriage, and their increased stature, hopeful signs that this physical improvement may so lighten the burdens of the coming woman that she may be more reconciled to the inevitable hardships of the lot which nature seems to have assigned to her. So far as physical training and the education of boys and girls at home, at school, or at college is in question, the differences between them do not seem great enough to demand any essential variation in methods, although there is some danger that, in rivalry with boys, the greater ambition of girls may lead them to overtax their inferior strength and energy. Young persons in robust health suffer little by occasional efforts at feats beyond their strength, but the danger increases with age. This argument, like other well-known ones, based upon sexual physiology but outside the scope of this article, in favor of separate education, applies with much greater force to young women at college than to girls at school. Every zoölogist knows that if there is divergent specialization in the minds of men and women, the diversity of their educational needs must increase with age, and the advisability of admitting women to universities which have been founded and organized for the highest education of men turns upon very different issues. But we are now concerned with average men and women, and cannot spare, for

the adequate presentation of a subject which involves only the exceptional few, space which should be given to more elementary matters.

The great educational problem of modern times is the reconciliation of the requirements of general culture with the demands of practical training; an answer to the question how soon "electives," or special studies, are to be permitted. Every parent, every teacher, every student, and every educational institution must meet and answer the question how soon the studies which give breadth and liberality and generous interest in the pleasures and ennobling resources of life are to be made subordinate to studies which are "practical." In the essay of 1879 I tried to show that the intellectual differences between men and women help us here, and as what I said then seems applicable now, I repeat it.

As society grows more and more complex and the sphere of human activity widens in all directions; as the points where man comes into contact with nature multiply, the amount of general liberal education which each of us needs for rational guidance in all the emergencies of life, and for the enjoyment of our share in its benefits, increases in geometrical progression. Meantime the special training which a person needs as a preparation for new and original work in any field of activity increases at the same rate, and encroaches more and more upon the time which is needed for liberal education. Thorough acquaintance with all the results, old and new, of intellectual activity in all branches of knowledge, so far as they conduce to correct living, is culture. This is to intellectual man what inheritance is to physical man. Culture is concerned only with results, not with methods or reasons, and it does not lead to progress. Special training is concerned with methods and reasons, and it values the results of the past only as they lead to advancement. It looks to progress in some one definite line; some one radius in the spreading circle of the domain of human intelligence, and it ignores the rest of the circle. It is to intellectual man what adaptive modification has been to physical man. By culture we hold our own. By special training we reach higher levels. Both are equally necessary, and the great problem of the future is to secure each in as much perfection as possible without sacrifice of either. The analogy of the rest of the living world seems to indicate that this must be brought about by division of labor.

If the mind of woman has, during its evolution, gained peculiar aptitude for acquiring and applying the results of past progress, by empirical methods and without need for proofs and reasons, it would

seem especially fitted for culture as distinct from training; while the mind of man is best fitted for that inductive training by experiment and demonstration which leads to new advances. The hard fate which compels the boy to sacrifice some of the delights of culture in order to fit himself for competition with men presses less heavily upon girls; while, on the other hand, nothing equals a cultivated family circle for giving the advantages of culture,—in course of nature as it were,—without encroaching on the time needed for training.

If each type of mind is developed in the manner for which it will, after maturity, have especial fitness, we have the strongest reasons to believe that this will gradually extend that habit of judicious conduct which is the common property of our race, and that it will thus give more time for special training to those who are compelled to acquire it.

I do not feel competent to discuss the bearing of the difference between the sexes on the problem of female suffrage, for this is a practical question which must be handled by each community on its own ground, and abstract principles can give us little help. Still, so long as any considerable number of persons are convinced, from faithful study of the lessons of the past, that there are good reasons for caution and conservatism they may fairly demand proof of their error before they approve of any far-reaching change.

Many thoughtful persons are convinced that the average woman is far more likely than the average man of the same condition in life to act upon some other motive than mature disinterested judgment, and that the enfranchisement of women might add to the number of voters, already far too numerous in our country, who are led by tradition or self-interest or emotion, rather than by intelligent zeal for the welfare of the whole nation.

If this opinion is an erroneous one, the advocates of the enfranchisement of women must, as their first step, not only prove its error, but they must also prove that the participation of women in politics would make government distinctly better than it is now, for no change in established institutions which is not a definite advance can be considered. Nor can the plea that the votes of women would benefit women as a class be admitted; for every act of class-legislation is a national disaster, and no democratic government can recognize the existence, before the law, of any class with interests which are not those of the whole nation. The claim that the votes of women would remedy social evils from which they believe they are the chief sufferers is inadmissible for the same reason; for those who think they suffer most

from an evil or would be most benefited by a reform are not competent judges of its relative importance to the community as a whole. If one who is not an expert in social science may be permitted to have an opinion, it seems clear to a zoölogist that the only plea for female suffrage which can be admitted is the claim that it would benefit the community as a whole by strengthening democratic constitutional government.

Men of our blood have never been much given to blind confidence in the disinterestedness of our leaders or the perfection of our institutions, and the reason why no branch of the Anglo-Saxon race has made any retrograde step in popular government is to be found in its allegiance to constitutions. But a constitution is nothing more than a device to secure deliberation by a system of checks and counter-checks on hasty action, and is of no value in the absence of a judicial frame of mind.

If the belief, that women are on the average emotional rather than judicial as compared with men, is an error, opportunities to prove it so are abundant now, and there are alarming signs that they may be still more abundant in the near future. The spread of emotionalism throughout our country gives cause for grave apprehension. The sturdy individualism which carried our forefathers through all their difficulties is commonly called a *manly* virtue. Whether it be manly or not we can never have too much of it; for the habit of looking the ills of life squarely in the face, of accepting them, and doing all we can to make the best of them, is essential to prosperity. If women can help to strengthen this habit among our people every true American man will welcome their aid, nor will he permit any old-fashioned opinions as to their mental character to hinder him from frank and generous acknowledgment of his mistake.

If we have among us any considerable number of persons who have not fallen heir to the steadfastness of our forefathers; persons who, unmindful of their debts to established society, believe they have everything to gain and nothing to lose by social convulsions; persons who talk of their "subjection" to somebody or something, and instead of bravely facing the difficulties which beset us all, try to evade them and wait for something to turn up, or, failing this, to turn up something which, if it do not accomplish what is wished, will be sure to accomplish something else;—if such persons are numerous the outlook is gloomy. Their frame of mind delights the agitator; it is easily led from one project to another; its impulses cannot be controlled by

reason for they are not founded upon deliberation; it is as quick to turn upon its leaders as to follow new ones; and whether its motives be good or bad, whether it be led by craft or by sincere fanaticism, its tendency is not constitutional but revolutionary. If man's view of woman is a mistake; if this frame of mind can not properly be described as feminine; let the women of our country see to it that their influence is brought to bear in favor of judicial deliberation and calm stability.

Whatever may be the outcome of the struggle which is now agitating our country, it has shown the existence among us of an emotional element which can easily be led on from one hasty and ill-considered effort at reform to another. In the past it has been said that women have been in the van of this sort of agitation. Let the women of the United States see to it that this is never said of them, and they need not wait long for any privilege of citizenship they may desire; for they will have shown their title to be enrolled among the bulwarks of our liberties.

W. K. BROOKS.

INSTRUCTIVE DISTRICT NURSING.

IN every form of practical philanthropy it is especially desirable that in relieving distress nothing be done to diminish the sense of independence and self-respect of those who are aided. Yet even the industrious and thrifty laborer works upon a margin so narrow that the protracted illness of himself or a member of his family may at any time not only exhaust his slender savings, but throw him into debt. Or it may place him in such permanent dependence upon others that he finally acquires a sense of right to support by the community. It is at such crises, therefore, that temporary aid is most helpful; and no form of assistance can be less injurious than that which is directed toward an early recovery from illness.

The hospitals long ago recognized this need, but there are people whom the hospitals cannot help,—those who through mistaken prejudice will die at home rather than enter a hospital; those whose diseases are incurable, as, for instance, consumptives, cancer patients, and paralytics, for whom there is frequently no hospital provision; and, finally, those whom it is unwise to separate from their families. For all such cases there is evident need of adequate care in the home. But even a greater good may be accomplished if it be possible to secure intelligent and skilful assistance in those cases of acute illness which may be quickly cured if treated in time. To render such aid in all these cases District Nursing was established; not in any sense duplicating the work of the hospital, but finding its chief function in the direction of *preventive treatment*, the preëminent value of which is now universally admitted.

District Nursing began in England in 1875, when Mr. William Rathbone, M.P., employed a woman to go about among the sick poor of Liverpool and minister to their needs in their own homes. So great and immediate was the practical benefit of the service thus rendered that other cities followed the example of Liverpool. In 1885 Miss Abbie C. Howes, of Boston, who had watched the workings of the English system, came back to the United States filled with the desire to see a similar system established in her own city. Meanwhile Miss

Phebe G. Adam, who was devoted to the administration of day nurseries in Boston, had become convinced that the fundamental need of the little children who were daily brought to these temporary homes was the education of their mothers in simple sanitation. These two ladies, who had thus arrived at the same idea independently and from very different experiences, laid the matter before the Woman's Education Association—an organization which has launched many noble and now independent enterprises—and induced it to undertake the initiation of the new charity in Boston. A committee was formed, a small sum of money was guaranteed, and the work was started with one nurse,—a work that appealed to the public because it promised not only the immediate relief of much suffering, but also a gradual improvement of the public health. Similar work, but upon a somewhat different basis, was begun almost at the same time in Philadelphia, and there are now, in 1896, carefully organized associations for District Nursing in New Bedford, Brooklyn, Chicago, Kansas City, Buffalo, and Baltimore. In addition to the work done by these specific organizations, nurses are sent out by the general charities or by churches in New York City, Wilmington, Delaware; Hampton, Virginia, and other cities, and similar experiments are being constantly undertaken.

It is to be expected that under the widely dissimilar conditions which obtain in various localities, different methods of organization and operation will be followed. It is no less true of District Nursing than of all other important enterprises, that each organization must work out its own best development, adapting itself to local demands and to the possibilities of its situation. The present paper will be restricted to a description of the methods of the District Nursing Association in Boston,—an association entirely dependent upon voluntary subscriptions; which has had a career of uninterrupted success for eleven years; and whose experience it is hoped will be helpful to other cities desirous of establishing similar organizations for aiding the sick poor.

It has always been the aim of this Association to keep its machinery of administration at a minimum, allowing it to develop naturally with the accumulation of experience. The conduct of its affairs is vested in a board of twenty-five managers, all of them women, who hold monthly meetings for the transaction of routine business and for the discussion of the many perplexing and interesting problems which constantly arise. Sub-committees are formed to do special work as occasion demands. The annual meeting, to which all donors are invited,

is held in February, and at this meeting reports of the officers, of nurses, and of physicians are received. The Association has established an office which is in charge of a salaried agent for seven hours every week-day. Her duties include keeping, in books prepared for the purpose, a record of all cases, their treatment, and discharge. She also prepares bandages for the nurses, receives applications for emergency nurses, and acts generally as the representative of the Association.

At the present time the Association employs twelve nurses, eleven of whom are occupied in the city of Boston, being able to cover nearly the entire area occupied by the poorer classes, and one is supplied to the neighboring city of Cambridge. In addition the Association furnishes, at the request of any physician of repute, a nurse for a limited time, during which she lives at the house of the patient as in private nursing. This emergency work is a very valuable accessory to the ordinary routine, but it has been found inadvisable to retain special nurses for it; they are, therefore, as a rule, selected from the Registry of Trained Nurses.

For the last two years the Association has also provided a nurse to care for crippled children sent to their homes from the Children's Hospital. This nurse has gone wherever the surgeon in charge has directed her, frequently traveling forty miles a day. Her duties have been mainly to teach the mothers how to bathe and move the patient, and how to keep complicated apparatus in place so as to avoid the discomfort and mischief which are the result of ignorance. The work has proved so successful and important that it has now been assumed by the Children's Hospital, by whose staff of nurses it can be done with far less effort and expense.

Each district is supervised by two members of the Board of Managers to one, or both of whom the nurse makes a weekly report at the office of the Association. Once a month each nurse makes a brief written report of her cases to the president, more especially in order to show what instruction she has been able to give, and its results. Once a month also, the president meets the full staff at the office, for criticism and advice. At this meeting it has of late been customary to invite some physician of the city to read a paper, which may serve to give to the nurses new light upon old subjects and to keep them abreast of the times. Sometimes he illustrates his theme by simple experiments or interesting microscopical preparations.

In the appointment of nurses the Association has found it best to admit to its service only graduates of training schools of the first rank.

In the early days the directors were criticised for the costliness of such a regulation, but experience has proved its wisdom. In illness the best nurse cannot be too good; and in order that these sympathetic women may satisfactorily perform their daily task—which is not only to heal the physical ailments but also to uplift the ignorant and discouraged people with whom they deal—they require the authority which only skill and education can give. The visiting nurse, whose sole gospel is that of cleanliness and health, must inevitably teach all whom she meets the value of decent living, the necessity of respecting one's self and one's neighbor, the interdependence of moral and physical strength. Such lessons cannot be wisely and tactfully enforced save by women of the best training, and even among these District Nursing demands those who have particular gifts. Many a woman who would succeed almost anywhere as a private nurse finds the district work repugnant and overwhelmingly difficult because of the ignorance and prejudice which abound, the exhaustion from the daily exposure and the long distances to be traveled, the meagreness of the supplies, and—in spite of her ardent efforts—the lack of results from her teaching. A strong faith in humanity, a patient belief in the ultimate result stretching on far beyond her own life of service, a self-sacrifice which may amount to heroism, a quick wit, and fertility of resource are the requisites for truly successful District Nursing. Notwithstanding the peculiar hardships, and the relatively small salary of \$600 a year (an amount less than that earned by most nurses engaged in private cases); the home life that is possible for some of them; the independence that all enjoy, with leisure in the evening and on Sundays and a month's vacation in summer; the valuable experience derived from the treatment of so wide a range of diseases,—make the career of a District Nurse very attractive to many women, as is evidenced by the long service of almost all the present staff.

The Association also maintains a staff of substitute nurses for which positions there are many applicants. These supply the places of the regular nurses while the latter are absent on their vacations, and from their number appointments are, if possible, made when new districts are opened or vacancies occur. This temporary experience of District Nursing often reveals to a woman her fitness or unfitness for such work without committing her to it indefinitely.

Before proceeding to review the operations of the Association in detail, it may be convenient here to introduce the following table which gives a history of the work in Boston, its scope, and its cost.

Year ending Jan. 31.	No. of nurses supported.	No. of districts occupied.	No. of cases attended.	No. of visits made.	Average of visits per case.	Average of visits per day.	Annual expenses.	Average expense per case.	Average expense per visit.
1887	2	2	707	7,182	10.15	22.94	\$1,224.01	\$1.73	\$0.17
1888	†4	5	1,836	17,056	9.28	54.47	\$2,691.46	\$1.47	\$0.16
*1889	†4	5	1,543	12,780	8.28	40.83	\$3,524.69	\$2.28	\$0.28
1890	6	6	2,131	26,056	12.22	83.24	\$4,498.14	\$2.11	\$0.17
1891	7	7	2,614	32,303	12.35	103.20	\$4,700.71	\$1.80	\$0.14½
1892	7	7	3,122	37,188	11.91	118.81	\$5,422.57	\$1.74	\$0.14
1893	†8	9	3,475	40,076	11.53	127.63	\$6,247.55	\$1.80	\$0.15
1894	†9	10	3,426	43,244	12.62	118.47	\$7,400.16	\$2.16	\$0.17
1895	§11	12	3,352	42,766	12.75	117.17	\$8,863.73	\$2.64	\$0.21
1896	11	11	3,396	41,857	12.32	114.68	\$9,563.70	\$2.82	\$0.23
Totals.			25,602	300,508	11.73	90.14	\$54,136.72	\$2.11	\$0.18

* During this year an emergency nurse was regularly employed throughout the year; but the calls upon her were so few that the practice was discontinued. The average expense was increased and the average work was less than in other years by reason of this experiment.

† Four nurses were employed during 12 months, and a fifth during 6 months and 9 months respectively.

‡ For the year ending January 31, 1893, a ninth nurse was employed for the last 2 months; and in 1894 a tenth nurse was employed for 6 months in Cambridge.

§ A twelfth nurse was employed for the last 2 months in the Roxbury district.

|| An additional nurse was employed 1 week in Roxbury, and 3 weeks in District No. X, South Boston.

There are two features of its general conduct which the directors of the Association have always felt to be the foundation of their success. First, the rigid insistence that the work of the nurses shall be done, as far as possible, with a view to instructing the patient and his family in the methods of sanitation and the simpler rules of domestic nursing; and, second, that the nurses themselves shall be under constant medi-

cal supervision. Hence the somewhat cumbersome but accurate title "The Instructive District Nursing Association."

1. In order that the benefits shall be more permanent than the temporary relief of pain, the nurse endeavors, after the first demonstration, to have some member of the patient's family take all the actual care of the patient that it is possible to leave safely in her hands, while the nurse stands by to watch and guide. Many are her discouragements; but there are also many instances of intelligent improvement to cheer her in her warfare with ignorance and indifference. The greatest interest and help in this part of the work come from the children, who are eager to learn new ways. They often become expert in simple bandaging or in the preparation of broths. Their elders, too, sometimes learn that fresh air is not deadly if admitted to a room without making a draught, and that the early application of simple remedies may prevent a cold from becoming a serious illness.

2. The second important feature of the work is the daily medical supervision of the cases. It is most desirable that such work as this shall have no connection with municipal politics, even to the exclusion of the regular city physicians. Boston is fortunate in possessing a well-endowed charity, the Boston Dispensary, established by private generosity more than a hundred years ago. For its purposes the city is divided into convenient medical districts, to each of which is assigned a physician whose duty it is to respond, free of charge, to all calls made upon him by the poor, at regularly appointed posts. The Nursing Association provides a nurse for each Dispensary district. In regard to medical treatment the nurse is as absolutely under the medical direction of the Dispensary physician as though she were employed for a private case, but in all other respects she is responsible to the Association. The two organizations are wholly independent in management and in funds; but they coöperate for mutual benefit so perfectly that each would now feel itself seriously handicapped if forced to work alone, and in such coöperation there is economy of effort, as well as a sharing of responsibility. Surely the Association is justified in the confidence that its work is doubly beneficent because so ably seconded by the best practitioners. Furthermore, it has largely conquered the aversion to the "free doctor" which is so common among the poor. As a District Nurse may not attend any case, however urgent, which is not under the care of the district physician, many a person whose neighbor has had her ministrations is induced to call the district doctor in order to secure the nurse.

It was a matter of discussion with the Association in early days whether it would be better to exact payment, even of a few cents, from the patients who receive care. In many cities this is done, or at least where the nurse believes the family able to spare such partial return for the service that is rendered. It is however doubtful whether the self-respecting poor who just manage to live independently while they keep well would not be the ones on whom such a regulation would press hardest, and whether the thriftless who do not object to being paupers would not receive the most help. Besides, while all are now treated free, and in most cases receive the care with gratitude, feeling under some obligation, they would be likely to consider, if they paid anything at all, that they had paid the full value of the nursing, and thus come to demand it as a right. The Association gives no alms, with the exception of occasional Diet Kitchen tickets, but refers all cases of destitution to the appropriate relief societies; in this way doing its utmost to coöperate with the established charities of the city. It lies within the individual discretion of each manager to relieve pressing cases of need without waiting for the relief societies, but she must do it herself and not through the nurse; the latter being of course always in close touch with her managers and able to report needy cases at any hour. For obvious reasons nurses are not allowed to receive presents from their patients nor to give them material assistance on their own account.

Perhaps the most important adjunct of the Association is its Loan Closet. In this Closet, which has four branches at convenient points in the city, is kept whatever is likely to be needed in the sick-room. Bedding, clothing for patients, apparatus ordered by the physicians,—all are supplied in abundance as *loans* to the patient. Each article is carefully marked, and each nurse is required to see that whatever she loans is eventually returned in a condition as clean and whole as possible. Blanks are provided upon which an exact record of each article loaned is made, and the loss during any year is astonishingly slight. The economy of such an arrangement is plain, since the same article may thus be used by several families during a year, and the wholesome moral effect upon those to whom the supplies are furnished has been very marked.

The Association finds a valuable auxiliary in the Boston Diet Kitchens, which are in full coöperation with the physicians and nurses, for with the very poor it is frequently a question rather of food than of medicine. Any Dispensary doctor may sign a "diet order" which a

member of the invalid's family can get filled free of cost, and which ensures fresh eggs and milk daily; or, if the family can spare the few cents necessary, the nurse can send to the New England Kitchen, where a greater variety of nourishing food is supplied at a minimum cost. Some of the managers furnish their nurses with tickets, worth five or ten cents each, which they can give to those who are quite unable to pay for the needed stews or soups or bread, which the New England Kitchen provides.

The Association has been obliged to make one important exception in its work of nursing the sick poor in their homes. It does not undertake to attend normal confinement cases. The time of the nurse is ordinarily completely filled with her regular work so that it would be impracticable for her to undertake duties that are of such indefinite occurrence and duration. Fortunately some of the city churches and some private organizations do provide free nurses for this special work, and it is the duty of the District Nurse to aid the woman in procuring their services, and also to render any assistance that may not interfere with her other duties. As soon as the child is born the Association will accept both mother and child as regular patients, provided only that the cases are put under the direction of the Dispensary physician.

The problem of infectious diseases has always been a most difficult one; nor is it yet solved. So long as the laws do not oblige a diphtheria or scarlet-fever patient to go to a hospital, the nurse can do no more than use such persuasion as she is mistress of to induce the patient to go there voluntarily. Failing in this, it is only possible for her to care for the case as well as conditions allow. Since real isolation is generally impracticable, and since ignorance and wilful carelessness intensify the difficulty, the task of preventing an epidemic throughout the tenement, or even the street, is appalling. Moreover, the nurse must take care lest she transmit the infection on her rounds. The usual disinfectants are employed; the most rigid instructions are given; and the nurse makes the visits if possible only at the end of the day's work, so that she may walk quickly home and disinfect herself. However imperfect this treatment, nothing better has suggested itself; and in the history of the Association there has, in fact, been only a single instance in which a nurse has been infected, and none in which the infection has been carried to other patients. A special nurse for infectious diseases would have little employment in Boston most of the time, and then there would come a time of stress when not one but half a dozen such nurses would be needed. In a case of great severity an

emergency nurse is employed, and for the rest the good judgment of the nurses must suffice.

When a case is critical and the home care uncertain, so that the doctor feels that removal to the hospital is imperative, he obtains the permit and says that the patient must go. Here often comes one of the most difficult tasks of the nurse,—to persuade the family of the individual that the doctor is right. Sometimes it takes days, and the ambulance comes only to be sent away, but finally, if the nurse will go with him, the patient may yield, and she takes him to his bed in the ward; or, it may be, no persuasions avail and unreason has its way. There are cases, however, in which the removal of the mother to a hospital means the neglect or destitution of the children. Both doctor and nurse feel that the home must not be broken up, and both redouble their visits and their care until the poor woman either recovers or dies.

The eight hours of service which it is stipulated each nurse shall give are often insufficient to meet the demands made upon them, and the nurses frequently add many hours of voluntary labor, forty visits being the average day's labor for most of them. No nurse is required to work on Sunday, yet it rarely happens that a nurse leaves all her patients from Saturday until Monday. Motives of professional pride and of humanity are constantly inducing her to make sacrifices of time and effort.

The daily routine of the nurse, while it varies very little in each individual case, may differ considerably in the several districts, since the Dispensary physicians make their district rounds at hours most convenient for themselves. All the nurses begin their work at eight o'clock in the morning; and at some regularly appointed place and hour, not necessarily at the beginning of the day, each nurse meets her physician,—to receive from him her order for the day, to report the progress of cases in the interval since the meeting of the previous day, and to make with him such visits and attend such operations as he may consider necessary. By the elasticity of rule which permits the nurse to suit the doctor's convenience in the matter, she may save him a good deal of needless visiting, or, on the other hand, she may hasten his return to a case where an unfavorable and unexpected change has occurred. After the interview with the doctor, for the rest of the day the nurse is responsible to the Association alone. She carries a bag provided for her, which contains besides other things, scissors, thermometer, atomizer, absorbent cotton, bandages, disinfectants, soap, and towels. Let us follow her on her way. She goes back, it may be, to

some sufferer whose bed she has already made that morning, but who has no trustworthy friend to give him the prescribed medicine. She may even in such a case have to take with her the medicine itself from the apothecary. Having climbed the long, dark flight of stairs and given the drug, she may find that the fire she has kindled on her first visit needs more fuel, that the room needs fresh air, or that the patient is feverish and wants a little more sponging. These things accomplished, with a warning word about medicines and the window, to a perhaps half intoxicated attendant, she goes on to the next case, feeling that if possible she must get back here once more to-day. Her next patient may be a child sick with typhoid fever, whose young mother has the sufferer wrapped in stuffy comforters that are as harmful as too little covering would be. An alcohol bath, a fresh nightdress and sheet properly warmed by the kitchen fire, with gentle words to the mother to show her how freshness and exposure are not synonymous, follow in rapid succession. Then the nurse takes and records the temperature on the chart, watches the mother as she prepares the milk according to directions previously given, and reminds her how dangerous it will be if she disobeys orders and yields to the child's clamor for different food.

On the next street lives a Russian Jewess who has sent for the doctor in great distress. Everything is dirty and neglected; there is no one to interpret between nurse and patient, but signs and gestures are intelligible, and in a little while the nurse brings order out of chaos, has some water heated, and is ready to give the restless, homesick woman a clean, comfortable bed, supplied, if possible, from the bureau in the room, but if that is not possible, from the Loan Closet of the Association. With the woman bathed, her hair brushed, and the bed freshened, the doctor's prescription can be followed. Then, knowing how much better it is for these poor people to help one another, the nurse goes through the tenement till she finds a kindly-disposed neighbor who consents to come in occasionally and look after the sufferer, and who will perhaps clean up the room or let her child go to the Diet Kitchen for the milk and eggs for which the doctor has signed the order. At the next house an ulcer is to be dressed, and the nurse sits by while a young daughter of the patient takes off carefully the old bandage. After the leg is cleaned and ready for a fresh bandage the girl brings with pride one which she has prepared "like Nurse's," and under the careful eye of her teacher puts it on for her mother,—a little awkwardly perhaps, but she is learning, and it answers the purpose.

And so it goes on all day long, back and forth, up and down, till evening comes; and everywhere the nurse has been the best friend that any of these people know. Children follow her on the street, women brighten and call to her as they see her pass, and although she wears no uniform or badge, even rough men step aside and, with a respectful bow, let her pass. She is known through all the streets of her district, and it may be she has been the only messenger of sunshine and health and hope that some of these discouraged and half-defeated ones have ever seen.

If the children of to-day can be taught how to prepare simple and wholesome foods, how to keep their homes in crowded tenements decently clean and ventilated, how to apply preventive remedies in the first stages of illness, and above all, to respect the sanctity of private life,—is there not reason to believe that in no distant day our poorer quarters will become less of a menace to public health and safety? Whether such hope be justified or not, the effort must be persisted in, and ought to recommend itself to the support not merely of the philanthropist and the humanitarian, but of the most self-absorbed of all dwellers in great cities. From the standpoint of self-preservation alone no one can afford to withhold his aid to the maintenance and extension of all work which directly seeks to improve the health of the poorest citizens, and this work must be continued all the more persistently while the present flood of immigration supplies the lowest stratum of society with increment from the Old World.

Few people stop to think how direct and intimate is their connection with the careless, the filthy, and the ignorant classes of their own city. Yet sanitary science has demonstrated that just so long as the families of the well-to-do are served by domestics whose friends live in the narrow streets and crowded houses of the poorer districts, the peril of direct infection will never be absent. The servant of a wealthy family who visits some friend for an evening and who there fondles an ailing child may return to care for the children of her employer, and these a little later become ill with diphtheria, for which neither mother nor physician can account. Does not a work which seeks to prevent or lessen the chances of such a catastrophe deserve, for this reason if for no other, most serious consideration and generous support?

MARY K. SEDGWICK.

THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE OF ARMENIA : A SUGGESTION.

At a time when the antagonism between Christian and Mohammedan in the East has again reached the acute stage, circumstances happen to have directed the attention of the writer of this article to the subject of the Military Brotherhoods of the Middle Ages, and thence he has been insensibly but almost inevitably led to consider some of the resemblances and differences between the age of the First Crusade—in which the Military Brotherhoods had their rise—and the present time.

In several respects the two eras are alike. The eleventh century, like the nineteenth, opened with expectations of vast changes; and the anticipated advent of the Millennium, with its new heaven and its new earth, hardly excited more visionary and extravagant hopes than the reign of universal fraternity which the French Revolution appeared to be ushering in. Later in both epochs, when these bright hopes had paled and faded into the wan reality of evils uncured and the continued strife of nation against nation, there came for both centuries a time when the sun seemed struggling through the clouds; and the proclamation of the Truce of God as a remedy for the misery of the peasant is perhaps comparable—at any rate as a protest against oppression—to the philanthropic legislation in England which has lately produced the Truck and Factory Acts. About the same time too, in both centuries, a new power seemed to have arisen to effect the unity of that somewhat vague collection of peoples, which one age has called "Christendom," and the other, "the civilized world": Hildebrand's lever was to be the universal authority of the Church; while that of the doctrinaire economists of the middle Victorian era was to be universal Free Trade. Furthermore, toward the end of both centuries Mohammedan cruelty to Eastern Christians kindled in Western nations a fierce resentment, and the Bulgarian and Armenian atrocities of our own time were foreshadowed eight hundred years ago by the renewal of the massacres of the pilgrims at Jerusalem. And lastly, just as in the present century there has been a greater development of philanthropy in the establishment of humanitarian institutions than the world has ever before seen, so the eleventh, if it were remarkable for nothing else,

should be gratefully remembered as the foster-mother of a particular class of such institutions; for it was about the year 1020 that some pious merchants of Amalfi founded that brotherhood for the relief of the sick and poor at Jerusalem which was afterward transformed into the illustrious Order of the Knights of St. John.

It is not necessary to detail at any great length all the differences between the two ages. A dozen will at once occur to the reader. The most noticeable points of contrast are, perhaps, the difference between the position and power of Mohammedanism then and now, and the change from the mediæval to the modern conception of the necessary connection between design and execution. The Turk, who then was, and for centuries after was to be, the dread of Europe, is now its scorn, and his continued occupation of Constantinople is only possible for a single day because of the inability of the Great Powers to arrange to their general satisfaction the division of his cis-Hellespontine territories. Yet, enormous as this political change is, it is no greater than that intellectual change which has remodeled our ideas of the relation between the means and the end. Mr. Bryce observes in his "Holy Roman Empire" that,

"In the Middle Ages men's impulses were more violent and their conduct more reckless than is often witnessed in modern society, while the absence of a criticising and a measuring spirit made them surrender their minds more unresistingly than they would now do to a complete and imposing theory."

In fact the child-nations of the earlier age have now become men and learned to look before they leap; and an enterprise far less difficult than that which the Crusading hosts undertook—as by one impulse, and almost, we are tempted to imagine, without one thought—has within the last twelvemonth been definitely abandoned even before the full cost had been reckoned. With us the question is not merely, Is the end attainable? but, Is it, even if attainable, worth the means to be employed? With them the question was simply, What is the end? Once clearly recognized, that end was attained or attempted in a Bala-klava-like spirit which, if not war, was at least magnificent.

Seldom has the modern attitude been more explicitly stated than by the present British Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Curzon observed, during the debate on Armenia in the House of Commons, that "Crusades to-day must bear not only a chivalrous but a practical aspect." The declaration marks the distance which separates Mr. Curzon or even Mr. Gladstone from Peter the Hermit or

Walter the Penniless, for nothing is more striking than the fact that eight centuries ago the practical aspect was far more completely ignored by Christendom than even the chivalrous aspect is at present. Without military leaders, organization, transport, commissariat, or any clear idea whatever, except that of pressing onward to the rising sun, a vast crowd of 60,000 persons streamed on in motley disorder in the tracks of the goose and the goat which strayed onward before them. Thousands died by the way in Germany, Hungary, and the Eastern Empire, and the rest were cut to pieces almost as soon as they had landed on the shores of Asia. Even the more organized armies which followed that first mad rush had notions but little clearer of the means of attaining their object, and of the 700,000 men who mustered on the far side of the Bosphorus, not one in twenty reached Jerusalem. But though "the aggregate of human suffering and the waste of human power" thus displayed seem terrible to us who have just reluctantly come to the conclusion that the "Armenian atrocities" are not worth a great European war, we cannot, even at this distance of time, help feeling a thrill of emotion at the heroism which could inspire and endure such sacrifices for the sake of an idea. Despite Burke's famous utterance, the age of chivalry is not passed, and the very fact that hostile operations against Turkey were, and to some extent still are, seriously contemplated shows that it is not. All we require now is that, before we give it free scope, our chivalry shall be practical,—that is, that it shall have at least a chance of achieving its object, and that the object shall be to the general benefit. For this kind of chivalry, it seems to the writer, there is still room in the world, and it is toward a definite object that he would like to see it directed.

Political prophecy is notoriously hazardous, and even an opinion which is held by a large majority of dispassionate observers is often ill-founded. But it does sometimes happen that the writing on the wall is distinct enough, not only to need no prophet to interpret it to the king, but to be intelligible to all who see it. When Lord Salisbury uttered his memorable warning, that persistent and constant misgovernment must lead the Power that followed it to its doom, it must have been plain to all Europe that Ab-dul-Hamid had been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and, though a little longer time in which to put his house in order might still remain to him, his kingdom seemed already to be divided among other nations. In other words, the inevitable has become the imminent, and there is undoubt-

edly an enormous preponderance of opinion to the effect that before the first quarter of the twentieth century has elapsed, the Empire of the Sultan as we know it to-day will have been broken up.

Such an anticipation will arouse feelings of regret or delight, of dismay or triumph, according to the political and religious prepossessions of different persons. But in one sentiment almost everyone will join—in grave apprehension for the safety of the Christian subjects of the Sultan. In Turkey in Asia and Turkey in Europe together there are some 4,000,000 Christians under the direct government of the Porte, the Armenians alone numbering over 2,000,000; and one of the strongest arguments in favor of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Turkey has been that such interference, whether successful or unsuccessful, would immediately stir up against these the relentless revenge of the dominant race. The Moslem, fanatically cruel in the hour of victory, is doubly so in the hour of defeat, and if the Ottoman Empire goes down in that “tempest of blood and fire” which has been predicted for it, the consequences to its political and religious foes will be terrible. In European Turkey the Christians are accustomed to act together, and they have powerful nations within hail. The struggle there will be on somewhat equal terms. But in Asiatic Turkey, between Mohammedan Kurds and Mohammedan soldiers, the Armenians might be almost blotted out in a single week. Here then, if anywhere, is a field for the practical chivalry of this later age—the protection of Christians in the East.

“Chivalrous,” it may be urged, “but hardly practical!” “Ships,” as Lord Salisbury has said, “cannot operate in the mountains of Asia Minor, and before troops could arrive in the interior, the massacres of Sassun might have been repeated in twenty different places.” There is considerable force in the objection. It has never been accounted useless, however, to lock the stable door *before* the steed is stolen, and the object of this paper is to suggest a means of averting the evil.

Few more striking instances of complete change of ideal could be given than that afforded by the history of the Military Brotherhoods of the Middle Ages. Remembering a few passages in “Ivanhoe” or “The Talisman,” a few denunciations by Carlyle, or a few sarcasms of Voltaire, we are in the habit of regarding them as successively haughty, despotic, unprincipled, wealthy, luxurious, useless, and finally mischievous Orders, about whom when we have admitted that they were brave, we have said almost all the good we can. Yet, if they deserved such a description at all, it was only in their later stages and when they

had lost sight of their original ideals. Indeed, they were at first for the most part purely charitable organizations, founded for the relief of poor pilgrims, and it was only when they extended their work of mercy from the hospital to the battle-field that they took up arms and became the terror of the infidel and the solace of the Christian. But even then their work was by no means exclusively military or therapeutic. Lands accrued to them in every country in Europe, and their priors and preceptors became stewards of great estates. In two instances too—and this more nearly concerns our present purpose—an Order took possession of a large tract of country for its own occupation. The Knights of St. John found the island of Rhodes a wilderness and left it a garden: the Teutonic Knights found East Prussia a swamp and left it a fruitful field. Yet all the time they kept the maintenance of their faith, whether against Moslem or pagan, steadily in view, and were always as ready to attack the infidel as to defend the Christian.

To-day the Turk needs no attacking: the "Sick Man" may be left to meet his approaching dissolution. But during those last hours the Christian may need protecting, and as it seems hopeless to expect any help from the Concert of Europe,—while the intervention of a single nation seems equally out of the question,—it is only from some voluntary organization that help can come. To be strong enough, such an organization must be military; to be imposing enough, it must be non-national, or rather open to, and supported by, the Great Powers; to be above suspicion, it must work without thought of gain, and whatever surplus there may be of income over expenditure must be devoted to the further development of agriculture and industry. An institution—call it a Brotherhood, a Society, a Company, or what you will—conducted on these lines would have at any rate the chance of great usefulness.

"This is all very well," it may be urged, "but how are you going to construct such a Society, and how in constructing it are you going to avoid arousing political jealousies which would shipwreck the whole scheme at the start?" The answer is that such a Society exists to our hand; for in England, Germany, Italy, and Spain there still survive fragments of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem; the French "langue" has only recently been suppressed; and in Russia, even in this century, not only has a new Priory been created, but the Czar has accepted the position of Protector of the Order.¹ If these fragments

¹ Porter: "Knights of Malta."

could be brought into touch with each other there would be at once, ready-made, the ancient framework on which a modern Brotherhood could be built up.

Metaphor at times deceives us, and we are often led to trace an analogy, which does not exist in fact, between the corporate life and nature of an institution and the corporeal life and instincts of a man. Yet if ever there were an excuse for such argument by analogy there would be an excuse in the case of the Order of St. John, which has at times seemed inspired with a conscious life of its own, and whose history during seven centuries has been one continual and on the whole successful effort to adapt itself to altered circumstances. Before the First Crusade, as has been said above, it had its origin as a hospice for sick and poor pilgrims, whose nurses and monks were already engaged in their works of mercy when, just eight centuries ago, the trumpet tones of Peter the Hermit were summoning Europe to the defence of the holy shrines. With the first successes of the Christians in the East the Order was reorganized and became a military and a monastic as well as a charitable Order. Till the end of the thirteenth century its Knights, with those of the Temple, formed "the regular militia of the Holy Land," and when Palestine was finally lost to Christendom, it found—first in Cyprus and then successively in Rhodes and Malta—an opportunity of carrying on its self-imposed task. Its occupation of Rhodes undoubtedly saved Rome from the fate of Constantinople, and its possession of Malta proved a great check upon the pirates of the North African coast, for both islands were fortified with such skill that for ages all attacks on them failed; and thus possessing an impregnable citadel, the Order was able to extend its maritime supremacy over the whole of the Eastern Mediterranean. It was only when the hurricane of the French Revolution was uprooting the firmest institutions in Europe that the destruction of the Order was apparently accomplished; and yet since then it has again adapted itself to its environment and shown signs of life in various countries. In England it has thrown out one branch which has developed into "The National Society for the Aid of Sick and Wounded in War," and another which has become widely known as "The St. John Ambulance Association." In Germany the Bailiwick of Brandenburg, under its better known name of "the Johanniter," not only did notable service to the wounded on the field in the wars of 1866 and 1870, but took a prominent part in carrying out the Geneva Convention. In Jerusalem, however, is to be found at once the most ancient and the most modern development

of all, viz., the Ophthalmic Dispensary, where a wholly non-sectarian work is being performed by the same society, on the same lines, and in the same place, as when it was begun 850 years ago.

The framework is already to our hand, then, and in being international and charitable it fulfils two of the three necessary requirements. The third or military side of its constitution it could reassume to-day even more easily than it assumed it in the eleventh century, for there is more enterprise and ardor seeking vent now than even at the time of the First Crusade.

Nor would such an enterprise be any real novelty. It is not necessary to lay much stress on the ancient connection between the military orders and the Christians of Asia Minor, though it had important consequences in the Middle Ages. Yet in the last twenty years history has been repeating itself, and the establishment of Military Consuls in Armenia and Anatolia may be regarded as a tentative step in the direction of European guardianship against Mussulman injustice.

The establishment of Military Consuls, however, did not have a fair chance. They only began their labors in the summer of 1879, and in 1881 they were recalled. But in that short time they showed that great possibilities of usefulness lay before them. Mr. H. F. Tozer, —till lately a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and a well-known authority on Eastern matters,—when traveling in Asia Minor seventeen years ago, formed great hopes of the success of the new system. They were not, he says, fixed like ordinary consuls in any one city, but held a roving commission within a certain area, and were to collect information, especially as to commercial matters, as well as to be a continual protest against wrong-doing. In Kaisariyeh he found the new consul "occupied all day and every day in investigating all kinds of grievances." An American missionary in Kharput in the course of a conversation with him "thought that they might in time assume the position of 'residents' or authoritative advisers, and thus gradually become possessed of a more definite control." Even the news of their coming excited great expectations of real reforms, some of which might by this time have been carried out if the consuls had been able to acquire any administrative control.¹

Mr. Tozer's reflections on the subject of the industrial future of the country are worthy of careful consideration. After noticing the ex-

¹ "Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor," by the Rev. H. F. TOZER, pp. 30-32.

traordinary fertility of the soil—a matter which Colonel Burnaby¹ had emphasized a year or two before—and pointing out that it affords “ample openings for colonization,” he touched on the corruption of officials and the ignorance of the government—which disgusts even the Turks,—and proceeded to inquire for a remedy. The presence of a few consuls, however vigorous and able, was inadequate. A native government was impossible, because of the antagonism of creeds. Political jealousy must prevent any European state from undertaking the administration. A fourth suggestion—“the formation of an independent state by the combined action of the Great Powers”—seemed “outside the sphere of practical politics.”² Later in the book, however, he suggested three remedies which would at all events ameliorate the condition of the people; namely, the appointment of a Christian governor, to secure the inhabitants against speculation and oppression; the formation of a local militia, to protect them against the Kurds; and the expenditure of the revenue on local objects, to develop their resources.³ Now it is important to note that these three would all be attained by, and indeed if summarized would almost imply, the establishment of some such institution as has been suggested above.

It would be foolish to ignore the difficulties in the way of putting such a scheme into practice. Leaving aside for the moment the arrangement of details, we have the political difficulty to face. Jealousy, as Mr. Tozer well says, must prevent any European nation from being allowed to undertake the enterprise single-handed, and his further criticism, that the formation of an independent state by the combined powers was outside the sphere of practical politics, seems justified by the obvious reflection that Russia would not permit any military occupation of the country. Yet it may be doubted whether such a reflection, though obvious, is correct. Russia has already as large an extent

¹ “We rode over rich soil which had been left fallow for miles around. ‘There are not inhabitants enough to cultivate the land,’ was the guide’s answer to a question on the subject. He was doubtless right. Asia Minor needs a three-fold population to develop its natural wealth. . . . It could supply the whole of Great Britain with corn, and the mines of coal and of other minerals would prove a source of immense wealth to the inhabitants.” (“On Horseback through Asia Minor,” p. 172.) “It surprises a traveller to find that the Turks make so little use of their mines. In the course of my ride I passed through a country apparently abounding in iron, and with many traces of coal. At Madeh there is copper and silver. With intelligent engineers to explore the mineral wealth, Turkey would be able not only to pay the interest of her debt, but to become one of the richest countries in the world.” (*Ibid.*, p. 168.)

² *Ibid.*, pp. 185-94.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 418-19.

of territory as she can comfortably control; her orthodox rulers know well enough that they would be likely to have as much trouble with the Monophysite Eutychians of Armenia as they had with the Catholics of Poland; and, most important of all, her real interests do not at all lie in Asia Minor or in Armenia. The possession of the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and a ten-mile strip round the Sea of Marmora are worth more to her than the whole of the ancient kingdom of Rûm, with Armenia and Kurdistan thrown in. The reason is evident. Between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean runs a great mountain-barrier, through which no stream passes, and from which no river of any importance, save the Hermus and the Meander, flows southward or westward into the open sea. At the general overturn Russia, as some say, will, or, as others say, will not, get Constantinople. If she does, she will not want the added responsibility of Turkey in Asia; if she does not, its possession will be of no solace and of no use to her, for the mountains will still lie between her and her next natural objective—Mesopotamia and the road to the Persian Gulf,—as they lie now between Transcaucasia and the Mediterranean.

Yet even if the great Slavonic nation had the universal greed which English Russophobes attribute to her, she need see nothing alarming in the prospect of such an occupation. It is not suggested that it should be more than a temporary expedient with which to bridge over in safety a time of transition. No other European nation has any interest at all in Armenia except the interest of humanity, and Russia is near enough to anticipate any movements which may seem to threaten any interests which she has in that part of the world. Moreover, it would be a distinct gain for Russia—even assuming that she is to be the heir of the Asiatic possessions of the Porte west of the forty-second and north of the thirty-sixth parallel—that she should enter into the enjoyment of the vineyards and olive-trees which she planted not, rather than into the costly and laborious task of developing the resources of a country which for centuries has suffered from neglect, ignorance, and oppression.

It remains to put into shape the proposal to which all these considerations tend.

Ever since the Treaty of Vienna the Great Powers have claimed a gradually increasing right to regulate the affairs of the Porte—as Professor Holland¹ puts it, “to supervise the solution of the Eastern ques-

¹ Introduction to “The Eastern Question,” by T. E. HOLLAND, D. C. L., Chichele Professor of International Law at Oxford University.

tion, or, in other words, to regulate the disintegration of Turkey." "The Turkish Empire," he declares, "is placed as it were under the tutelage of Europe, while the claim of any single Power to settle the destinies of that Empire without the concurrence of the rest has been repeatedly negatived." In Greece, Egypt, Syria, the Balkans, and the Islands, as well as in Asia Minor, this right has been freely exercised, and it is now a truism of morals that the Great Powers have the responsibility of, as it has long been a truism of politics that they have the requisite authority for, the enforcement of good government. Yet good government has proved impossible of attainment, and there was never less promise of it than at this moment. In Article 61 of the Berlin Treaty the Sublime Porte undertook "to carry out without delay the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds,"—a promise which had previously been made to England separately, in return, not for the cession of Cyprus, as is so often alleged, but for the undertaking to protect Asiatic Turkey against further Russian aggression. The occurrences of the last two years show that no attempt has been made to fulfil these engagements, and the recent confession of the mingled impotence and disinclination of the Great Powers to enforce them makes one despair of their being any more conscientiously observed in the future than in the past. There is thus on the one hand no question of the right of Europe to insist that Turkey shall take whatever steps the Powers may agree in considering necessary for that purpose, and on the other very little of its inability, perhaps even of its disinclination, to ensure that those steps shall be taken.

Yet if the nations, as political units, are shy of meddling in the matter, there are in almost every nation many individuals who would gladly see it dealt with, and to whom the news of the state of things prevailing in Armenia came with a shock of horror and humiliation. They are of all ages and all classes; some of them young and some old, some of them rich and some poor; some of them hotly adventurous and some more coolly philanthropic; but they represent—in England at least, and probably in more than one other country—a large proportion of the nation. In politics—more especially in foreign politics—they are not apt to interfere, but their dissatisfaction is none the less strong for being suppressed. To such a class of observers, and I believe it to be a very large class, this paper is addressed. International action may be impracticable from the impossibility of securing a cor-

dial international agreement. National action may be impossible just because it is national. But action of some kind must be undertaken unless the Armenian massacres are to be repeated at the first unlucky opportunity. National and international action having failed, there remains voluntary action, and for voluntary action to be effectual, it is not in this case necessary that it should be initiated by national or international intervention. That weapon would be in the background, and could be employed with far more force on the occasion of the very first dispute.

It may seem that the mission of this "Brotherhood of St. John"—if I may so style this suggested society—would be in the nature of a forlorn hope, and that the society would be offering itself as a *corpus vile* for a risky though perhaps interesting experiment. If this were so, I do not think it would tell very strongly against the proposal: there are always volunteers in plenty for the forlornest and most dangerous of enterprises. But in truth it would not be so. It is not to be supposed that a few enthusiasts would recklessly scatter themselves over the provinces of Asiatic Turkey, and proceed to defend the oppressed and defy the oppressor on every possible occasion. The course of action would probably be of a very different kind. Starting with two or three seaport towns as their base, where they could purchase or construct buildings in strong positions, and where they could act in conjunction with, and as supplementary to, the European consulates, they might gradually extend their influence into the interior as their resources of men and money permitted, till a line of posts was established from sea to sea, with branches diverging laterally into the remote valleys of the interior. Each station would possess its own force of militia or police, and some sort of fortress capable of affording at any rate a temporary protection to fugitives as well as to the members of the Brotherhood; and at longer intervals there might be depots of more considerable size capable of holding out almost indefinitely against the attacks of any save regular troops. There would thus be existing, in the very heart of the now disturbed districts, cities of refuge, so to speak, which would not only be effectual sanctuaries in case of sudden local outbreaks, but would be capable of arresting in some degree the torrent of anarchy which will be let loose in Asia Minor when that country falls or is forced from the grasp of the Turk. These stations would also become in the interval centres of trade and industry, and by being the pioneers of commercial and agricultural development would be the first to profit by every fresh extension of their sphere of

influence; while, as they would not be working for their own enrichment,—and the appropriation to local improvements of all profits above a low fixed rate of interest must be one of the first of their rules,—they would be free from the temptations to which the promoters of less disinterested enterprises are prone. Chartered companies are in bad odor just now, but even Mr. Labouchere would hardly condemn a chartered company whose object was genuinely philanthropic rather than financial.

For such a task the descendants of one of the proudest Orders of chivalry may seem but little fitted; but, in truth, the undertaking would hardly differ more from the ordinary conception of their work and constitution than their own ideal differed from itself at various periods of their history. Who, for instance, could have supposed that the nurses and almoners of the eleventh century would have developed into the valiant knights of the thirteenth, and that they in turn would have suffered such “a sea change” as to become the bold sailors of Rhodes or Malta? Yet the same sentiment underlies all these various manifestations—the eager desire to uphold their own religion and to protect its helpless disciples against “the infidel.” It was only when they lost sight of that ideal, and became, as the Templars and the Teutonic Knights had successively become several centuries earlier, merely self-indulgent members of an anachronous caste, that the career of the Knights of St. John, like that of the Templars and the Teutonic Knights, seemed to have closed. At the very time of their apparent dissolution, however, they passed into yet another incarnation, and are probably at this moment in at least as flourishing a condition as they were eight centuries ago. The world may not be about to see another Crusade—though that is by no means certain—but the Brotherhood of St. John has reverted to its original character. If any human institution is capable of dealing with the perplexing and threatening condition of affairs in the East, it is probably an Order which has behind it so noble a history, and has so often proved at once its pliancy and its toughness.

Since the above was written affairs in Turkey have been going from bad to worse. The massacres in Sassun have been followed by the more dreadful, because more organized, massacres in Constantinople itself; and at the moment of writing comes the news of another outbreak of fanaticism at Kharpout, in which 4,000 Armenians are said to have perished. It is evident that what is to be done must be done

quickly. Fortunately, too, it is evident that a widespread and at the same time deep and fiery indignation has at last begun to stir the nations. In Italy, Germany, and France there are symptoms of a feeling which, despite the political exigencies of the moment, may force the hands of the mere *politiques*. England is humming like a hive of angry bees; a dozen meetings are being held nightly in the small as well as the large towns; and Mr. Gladstone, the great Achilles of the host, has been persuaded to come forth from his tent. Indeed, one English paper (the "St. James's Gazette") has gone so far as to suggest a new Triple Alliance between England, Italy, and the United States, for the purpose of dealing with the matter, in default of—or even in defiance of—the Concert of Europe. Now, therefore, if ever, is the time for action. If the storm breaks before some kind of shelter has been provided, the Christian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire will be exposed to its full fury. It may be that the storm will be upon them—that the Ottoman Empire will be breaking up—before anything effectual can be done. On the other hand it may be that that Empire will last some years yet. If so, we may be sure that the same raids, the same rapes, the same tortures, the same massacres will be repeated, till either the Armenians are virtually exterminated or some Great Power is shamed into forcible interference. The plan sketched out in this paper would then prevent some misery, be some check on the fury of the oppressor, and offer to at least a few indignant or charitable hearts the chance of defending the defenceless and of relieving the destitute.

W. K. STRIDE.

SHALL THE FRONTIER OF CHRISTENDOM BE MAINTAINED ?

I AM quite aware that, even within the limits of our modern civilization, the answer to this question might not be a unanimous affirmative. The century which now nears its close is the one which has most severely questioned and disputed the rights of the Christian religion to the universal dominion claimed for it by its friends and champions. Much of this questioning has been legitimate and important. Some of it has been deeply reverent and devout; and some, less praiseworthy in spirit. But question is not properly a final result. Those of us who have followed even with the greatest good-will the century's pitiless analysis may now be the first to say: "Enough of the negative side of the discussion. The defects of such Christianity as we have attained have been thoroughly considered and amply shown. We now call for a consideration of the other side. It is time for us to give some attention to the benefits which the Christian religion has conferred on nations and individuals that have received it."

We may as well here recognize the fact that, as Christian civilization has progressed and made itself felt, the general consensus of the human heart and intellect has been increasingly in its favor. The machinery which has organized and administered the Christian church, being of human workmanship, has indeed shared the defective character of all things human. Courageous souls have perceived this fact, and have dared to proclaim it, but they have not risen up against the true spirit of Christ's religion. What they assailed were the false doctrines and unjust assumptions with which human ambition and love of power have clogged its progress and thwarted its true direction. The early English reformers resisted the temporal tyranny and extortion of the Bishops of Rome, not the authority of Christ's gospel. Luther raised his voice against corrupt practices and doctrines which were entirely at variance with the spirit of Christian thought and action. For Christianity pure and simple, he was willing and ready to die. In our own age, Priestley, Channing, and Parker have vindicated the progress of the human understanding as shown in the clearer

interpretation and nearer application of Christian doctrine; but the youngest and boldest of these did not gainsay the profound significance of that doctrine, but only the perversion which it had undergone through centuries of partial and insufficient learning. I endeavor thus, briefly, to bring our consideration of the subject to the standpoint of to-day. Thanks to the chivalrous critics who have preceded us, we are somewhat able at this period to define the boundaries between pure religion and mongrel ecclesiasticism; between what Christ taught and what Alexandria, Nicæa, and Rome have seen fit to teach in His name.

With the effete material which the vitality of the Christian body has enabled it to slough off, I do not desire at the present moment to occupy my readers. What I would fain do, is to rouse the slumbering soul of Christendom to a sense of the value and interest of the truth which remains,—free of so much dross, inevitably gathered and mercifully dismissed,—and to claim for the purer interpretation of the Word the enthusiasm which mankind has shown at divers periods in behalf of its less worthy presentation.

Of one of the ancient errors of judgment above referred to, I must here make mention. It is the supposition, long entertained, that, outside the Jewish and Christian dispensations, mankind at large has had no availing religious experience. We are able at this day to understand and apply Paul's noble saying that God hath not left Himself anywhere on earth without a witness in human consciousness. To this end, he quotes to the Greeks one of their own poets: "For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said." Without Paul's erudition the Apostle Peter learns from his dream and its sequence, that "God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

The supposed claim of Christianity to the exclusive understanding of things divine, and the deprecation of this claim as illiberal and unjust, are matters that have played an important part in the work of question and analysis which has occupied a part of the religious world in our own time. I think that to-day this reproach can hardly be laid at the door of reasonable Christianity. The holding of a Parliament of Religions in Chicago, in the memorable Columbian year; the devout, harmonious, and reasonable tone of its proceedings; the intense interest with which they were followed;—these facts sufficiently vindicate the vanguard of the Christian church from the views so long

entertained of the futility of all other forms of belief. From my own observation and remembrance, I feel assured that the desire of those who organized and ruled over that assembly was not to force any creed or dogma upon unwilling minds, but to find, among all religions, a fundamental starting-point of agreement,—a belief in the infinite power, wisdom, and goodness of God, and in the witness which these create in the conscience of man, wherever that conscience has been raised above the brute tyranny of instinct and passion. It was a proud day for Christianity when it felt itself strong enough to open its doors to all believers, inviting them all to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness. Some words were said in that Parliament from which Christendom can not go back.

“Religion,” it averred, “is not a thing to conjure by. Neither is it a system of propitiation of one or more jealous and dangerous powers. It is the knowledge of divine love, and of its correspondence in the noblest of human affections. Worship is the homage paid to a Benefactor whose benefactions are inexhaustible. It is Man’s induction into his true inheritance, the knowledge of this Almighty friend, and the love which His love should call forth and diffuse among all human brethren.”

One truth the Parliament surely implied, though it did not specifically put it on record,—the truth that religious liberty is essential to religious life, and that no zeal for doctrine of any kind warrants the followers of that doctrine in considering as forfeit the life and human rights of those who do not accept it. Christendom itself has but lately attained this standpoint. Cruel wars have waged between Christians of different churches; persecution, rack and torture, flame and faggot, have been employed by people professing Christianity against Christians differing from them in views of theology and church government. We have passed beyond this now, and could no more go back to it than we could set aside the Copernican system and return to the astronomy of the ancients.

But from the old-time disputes between different bodies of Christians, Europe has inherited a plague-sore which to-day afflicts it to the very core. The mutual jealousies of the Greek church and the church of Rome allowed the remnant of the Byzantine Empire to fall into the hands of the Turk. Barbarism established itself in the city of the Cæsars. A religion based upon the bloody conquest and extirpation of unbelievers erected its shrines above the altars of Christendom, which it bathed in Christian blood. The political jealousies of Europe have made this barbarous power at home within the

borders of civilization. From time to time it has waved its bloody banner and sounded its savage tocsin. For ages it ground Christian Greece beneath its feet. Its officials cut out the tongues of Christian mothers in order that they should not teach their children the faith of their ancestors. In its brutal vocabulary, "dog" is the synonym for "Christian." In the first quarter of this century, it dared in the face of all Europe to perpetrate a wholesale massacre upon the inhabitants of the Greek island of Scio. Europe did not care much about this, but Lord Byron and Dr. Howe did care, and a youthful band of Philhellenes shamed the hoary diplomacy of Europe. The leaven of freedom now wrought a general uprising, and Greece threw off the shameful yoke. Within our own recollection, Crete rose up, and Europe aided the Turk in suppressing her efforts, thus confirming his bloody and barbarous rule.

And now, while we, grandparents of this generation, still linger to behold the things which are done under the sun, the Turk and his coadjutors have made unprovoked war upon a peaceful and unoffending people within their borders. They have glutted their cruel greed with the blood of thousands of Christian men, women, and children. Wholesale slaughter of "Christian dogs" has been their battle-cry. What battle! They have fallen upon defenceless hosts with fire and sword, ignominy and torture. America to-day is feeding the starving population from which Turk and Kurd have taken every necessary of life. And Europe sits quiet, and sees the banner of its Christian faith trampled under foot, and drowned in blood. Voices are raised, here and there, in wheedling and ineffectual protest, but no hand has stirred, no champion has stood forth to offer his brave life for the thousands of lives which have been ruthlessly sacrificed to insatiable greed and impenetrable superstition. Truly, I think that the dying prayer of the Master would avail more for the assassins than for those whose base compliance has suffered the bloody work to proceed. Those indeed know not what they do, following the barbarous maxims of a pre-Christian time; but the others—children of the nineteenth century, with all its enlightenment and lessons fresh in their minds—know full well what they permit and how it should be prevented.

There is a people outside of governments. There is a church outside of sects. To these, in the present distress, we may make appeal. Is this world-nation willing that unarmed and unoffending communities shall be swept out of existence simply to satisfy the love of plunder and the hideous thirst for blood? Is this world-church willing that a creed of bloody conquest shall take the place of a re-

ligion of peace and good-will among men? Are both Nation and Church ready to see the harem replace the Christian home, slavery stand in the room of service, and enlightened conscience strike her flag to Lust, Cruelty, and Rapine? If they are, would that the *fin du siècle* were the *fin du monde*!

But the blood-guiltiness which lies at the door of Europe is not the only evil resulting from the active and passive wickedness of the Turk and his tolerators. In the countries in which his bloody discipline has been allowed to prevail, men and women, with the fire on their roof and the knife at their throat, have to some extent been compelled to renounce their Christian profession in order to save their lives, their children, and their homes. We can imagine a father purchasing thus the honor of his daughters, a mother defending thus the cradle of her babe. But experience shows that these apostate Christians gradually descend to the level of their conquerors, and perhaps fall below it, sinning against a higher culture and a better light. In their offspring the traces of Christian influence become obliterated, and the good work of centuries is lost. Unending mischief to society grows out of these enforced adoptions of the Mussulman creed. Europe, in permitting them, prepares for herself a nursery of dangerous and deadly foes. Subjects and co-religionists of the Turk, these people will hereafter act with him in defence of irresponsible and despotic rule. Despite the prophecy of good Bishop Berkeley, the military progress of the civilized world is now toward the East; so let those whose advance bears the banner of Christian civilization take account of this source of danger—easy to deal with now, but sure to grow more deadly with every year of neglect and permitted existence.

The political economist, Michael Chevalier, some fifty or more years ago, published a work in which he spoke of Russia and America as two young giants, already meeting at the North, and in time destined to come together at the South also. This prediction has not as yet fulfilled itself. On the other hand, Russia and England, representatives of despotism and political freedom, are threatening to come together in the East; not in friendly rivalry as the United States and Russia might have done, but in irreconcilable opposition and deadly conflict. The Turk is now the ally of Russia. See to it, England, that these despotisms, united, do not for all time deprive you of your natural allies, the Christians of the East!

I have said my say; and yet, to the world-church of which I spoke just now, I would gladly make a further appeal. Those of us who

follow the movements of the religious world must have observed among its manifestations that of an increasing desire to be able to take united action against the crying evils which still prevail on earth. The Bishop of Rome places the condition of this accord in the submission of all Protestant sects to his sway. The reunion of Christendom, as I view it, may be promoted in quite another way. The causes which brought about the revolt of Protestantism against the authority of Rome exist to-day as truly as they existed in the times of Wycliffe and of Luther. The universal sway of the Pontiff would be as impossible now as it appeared then. But, instead of an impossible retrogression, can we not go forward to-day to an enthusiasm for Christianity itself which shall impart to the whole Christian body a new unity of sympathy and of action? The flaming heart of Calvary is now the mild and diffused light in which all Christians walk. Can we not heartily greet all who come within its influence? Can not the world-church at large acknowledge this illumination, and turn from its metaphysical differences to give one solemn and united cheer for Truth? And can not this united Christendom set its back against the ocean and its face toward the East, saying: "In the name of God and of Humanity, we will give place to no worship which demands the disregard of human brotherhood or the shedding of human blood. If the creed of Mohammed sanctions the enormities recently perpetrated in its name, we will oppose it with our might, and denounce it as barbarous, accursed, and incompatible with the enlightenment to which civilized Man has attained"?

JULIA WARD HOWE.

MODERN ARCHÆOLOGY: RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN GREECE.—III.

IN continuation of the recital of the work carried on by the foreign schools of archæology established in Athens, this third article will deal with the exploration of the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi. Being one of the most important sites in Greece, in point of celebrity and expected results, it was a prize for which the French had long striven, desiring to secure it from the Greek government as the only adequate equivalent of the concession of the Olympian exploration to the Germans. Both were, no doubt, signal favors to two great and friendly nations, and both were conceded not without opposition on the part of Greek archæologists and scholars, who, naturally enough, desired that the *kudos* of the exploration of sites of such paramount importance should rest with the country itself. But the Greek government was morally bound in this matter by the engagement, informal and vague though it was, which its delegates at the Congress of Berlin had assumed toward the late M. Waddington, whose advocacy of the Greek cause on that occasion entitled him to special consideration. Moreover, the French School at Athens had already, in 1881 and 1887, made tentative excavations on the site, under MM. Foucard and Haussoullier, resulting in the discovery of some important data. So that after considerable delay a convention, similar to that regarding Olympia, was signed between Greece and France in April, 1891, the draft of which, however, was dated as far back as 1887.

The recital of these circumstances will prove, I believe, of special interest to American readers. For, while the final negotiations of the convention were in progress, I was approached by a gentleman who was then agitating to secure the concession for the American School, and I was appealed to to use my influence with the Greek Prime Minister, so that preference might be given to the proposals submitted on behalf of that institution. Being then accredited as Greek Minister to the United States as well as to the United Kingdom, I did not fail to urge that request; but I was surprised to be officially informed, in reply, that at the time I had been so approached, and while subscrip-

tions were being collected in America for the sum needed to carry out the provisions of an expected convention as to Delphi, the fact that the Greek government could no longer entertain any other proposals than those of France had already been made known to those who had persisted in the agitation. The funds, however, subscribed meanwhile in America, once collected, were turned to use in prosecuting other excavations at Argos, which, but for this happy coincidence, might perhaps not have been found possible.

In the whole of the ancient world there existed no spot which, to a great religious prestige, combined so widespread a renown and so unrivaled a wealth of artistic treasures as the Oracle of Delphi. Nature herself had endowed it with all that could appeal to the imagination and inspire men with a sense of mystic awe. Landing at Itca and journeying northeast up the small plain of Krissa, the wayfarer enters a mountain-hedged ravine, through which flows the Pleistos, and is soon confronted by a barrier of precipitous crags rising up before him like gigantic buttresses, as if to support the majestic Parnassus, the snow-clad crest of which is seen soaring high into the clouds. At the point where this rocky wall forms an obtuse angle, it is sharply cleft into a narrow chasm hemmed in on each side by stupendous cliffs, whose peaked summits are visible from afar as one approaches Itca from the Gulf of Corinth. They are the famed Phædriades, the shining or resplendent rocks, Nauplia and Hyampeia. Close under the spur of the latter, shaded by two gigantic plane-trees—secular descendants of the old *platanos*, there planted by Agamemnon—springs the ice-cold and crystal-pure water of the Castalian Fountain, at which the pilgrims washed and sprinkled themselves before approaching the oracle. The sanctuary of the god stood to the left, at the foot of the overhanging rocks, on a succession of embankments, terraces, and passages on which rose, amphitheatre-like, a multitude of temples, statues, porticos, and public buildings—all dedicated to the service of Apollo.

It is impossible to conceive a worthier site for a great and mystic shrine. The grand solemnity of immortal Parnassus, the beetling precipices frowning down upon the narrow ravine, the limpid springs bursting out of the rocks, the sudden gusts of wind wildly rushing amid the crags, the mighty echo which resounds along the encircling wall of rocks, form a scene of imposing grandeur and enchanting beauty, which seems to command the enraptured reverence of man. And the religious imagination of the Greeks fixed upon this spot as the abode of a sublime, beneficent, and miracle-working deity.

It was here that, five days after his birth at Delos, the far-darting Apollo slew Pytho, the dragon whose lair was in the grotto of the sibyl, and established his oracle, a source of counsel and comfort to men. Not only Greeks from far and near, but, as Lucian enumerates, "Phrygians, Lydians, Persians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, Italians, and even Hyperboreans" reverently sought advice of the god in all matters of private interest or of public weal,—from the cure of sickness and guidance in journeys, to the framing of laws and the issue of wars. Herodotus gives a long list of the costly offerings from Asiatic sovereigns; the Greek cities paid a fixed annual tribute to the god; and their colonies, most of which were established on the advice or at the command of the oracle, all sent rich gifts. An enormous harvest of wealth was thus gathered at Delphi, which soon became also the centre of the most ancient confederation of Greek states. As early as 596 B.C. the Delphic Amphictyony, under the direction of Solon, waged the First Sacred War against the neighboring Krissæans, who paid for their systematic depredations on pilgrims to the shrine by the destruction of their city and the annexation of their rich plain to the sacred domain. With the spoils of this war the Pythian games were founded in 586 B.C. and continued to be celebrated every fourth year.

The great temple of the god having been destroyed by fire some forty years later, the Amphictyons decided to rebuild it on a scale of magnificence commensurate with the wealth and fame of the oracle. Of the 300 talents (\$575,000) required—a very great sum according to the value of money at that time—a fourth was supplied by the Delphic treasury, and the rest was defrayed by contributions of the Hellenic world; Amasis, the king of Egypt, also claiming the privilege to subscribe.

The enormous riches thus gradually centred at Delphi naturally attracted the cupidity of the invading Persians who, in 480 B.C., attacked the sanctuary. The Delphians retreated before overwhelming odds, but the god himself worked prodigies of storm and thunder. An earthquake cleft the rocks of Parnassus asunder, crushing many of the pillagers to death, while the rest were put to flight by the Delphians who, now encouraged by shouts of victory proceeding from the temple of Athena Pronoia, had sallied forth from their hiding-place. No less miraculous was deemed the repulse of the Gauls under Brennus in 279 B.C., when again the elements interposed, the overhanging rocks were rent, and the heroes of old, rising from their tombs, led the people against the dismayed barbarians. This victory, which was actually due

to the bravery of the Ætolians, is specially memorable in connection with the subject of this article, because of the remarkable discovery to which I shall refer hereafter.

The Second Sacred War, waged (357-346 B.C.) against the Phocians who had sought to appropriate the plain of Krissa, was instrumental in establishing the power of Philip of Macedon in Greece. But it was only under the Romans that the pillage of Delphi actually began. Sulla first seized the treasure for the payment of his troops, besieging Athens in 86 B.C. Nero carried away 500 bronze statues, and, having been rebuked by the god for the murder of his mother, he parceled out the plain of Krissa among his soldiers and abolished the oracle. It was restored by Hadrian, and regained much of its former splendor under the Antonines. Pliny states that in his time there were still left some three thousand statues at Delphi. But Constantine appropriated most of these for the adornment of his new capital (A.D. 330) and removed there many of the other rich offerings, including the famous bronze tripod, formed of three intertwined serpents, which the king of Sparta had dedicated, out of the Persian spoils, in memory of the victory of Plataea, the names of the Greek states being incised on it. What still remains of this most ancient and most renowned of the world's art relics may be seen to this day in the Hippodrome at Constantinople; its very dilapidation recalling a great event—the entry into the imperial city of the conqueror Mohammed II (A.D. 1453), who, with a blow of his iron mace, broke off the head of one of the serpents as he sped on to Santa Sofia. Julian “the Apostate” (A.D. 362) vainly sought to instil new life into the oracle. Its plaintive answer was its last expiring gasp: “Tell the king the fair-wrought dwelling has sunk into the dust; Phœbus has no longer a shelter or a prophetic laurel, neither has he a sparkling fountain: the fair water is dried up.” Finally, fifty years after Constantine, the neophyte Theodosius closed the temples, suppressed the oracle, and the triumphant fervor of the Christians worked havoc on all objects connected with the idolatrous worship.

In spite of repeated plunders, Delphi must have preserved, almost to the last, the appearance of a veritable museum of art, such as Pausanias describes it (A.D. 160). He refers to some one hundred and fifty statues of gods and goddesses, the works of the most celebrated sculptors of antiquity; to ten statues by Phidias, offered by the Athenians in memory of Miltiades and his companions in arms; to the Phryne of Praxiteles; to many effigies of victors at the games, and to other innumerable offerings in marble, bronze, and gold. He describes

the famous paintings of Polygnotus in the *Lesche* (Club-house) of the Cnidians, and he speaks of five temples besides the great shrine of Apollo. Of its two pediments the eastern was devoted to the representation of Apollo and the Muses, and the western to Dionysos and the Thyiades. The scenes figured on the metopes, as described by the chorus in the "Ion" of Euripides, related to the triumphs of gods over monsters; while the two great victories over the barbarian invaders at Delphi were commemorated by golden shields on the architraves, dedicated by the Athenians and the Ætolians respectively. A bronze statue of Homer stood in the *pronaos*, on the walls of which were inscribed the sayings of the Seven Sages; and the iron chair on which Pindar sat when singing his "Hymns" to Apollo was preserved in the cella. Indeed the whole sanctuary typified the attributes of the great God of Light, the personification of Hellenic culture, as opposed to the obscurantism and ignorance of the barbarians. The statue of the god himself stood in the *adyton*, the holy of holies, where few mortals ever set foot, and where the *omphalos*, the navel and centre of the earth, was treasured. The *omphalos* was a white stone in the shape of half an egg, supported by two eagles, which, when sent by Zeus to the East and to the West, met in their onward flight at Delphi. Here also was the fissure through which the narcotic vapors issued; and over it stood the tripod on which the Pythoness, the prophet-maiden, sat and delivered the oracle. Her responses, often incoherent, were communicated to the enquirers in hexameter verse by the priests, all men of vast experience, great learning, and tried sagacity. That their ministry was on the whole beneficent is admitted not only by the testimony of great poets—Pindar, Æschylus, and Sophocles—but by Plato himself, who speaks of the oracle with respect and veneration. Pausanias refers furthermore to the *Stoa* (Portico) of the Athenians; to the eight treasuries of the Hellenic states which had thus permanent establishments at Delphi; to the gymnasium, the theatre, and the *stadium*.

The site of the latter, on the highest point of Delphi, was clearly visible even before the excavations and was known among the peasants as Lakoma, "the hollow." So also the theatre, of which Cyriaco de' Pizzicolle (Cyriacus of Ancona) counted thirty-three rows of seats still standing in 1448, when he visited Greece. Some of the shafts of the temple, remains of the *Stoa*, and a considerable portion of the wall enclosing the sanctuary were also traceable. A number of inscriptions and other fragments were preserved in a rough building in the neighborhood, and during the preliminary excavations the French deter-

mined also the site of the *Lesche*; but the rest of the sacred precinct was entirely covered by the modern village of Kastri. An important contribution to the topography of the site was the detailed plan made in 1888 by Herr Pomtow, who, with true German thoroughness, had marked every vestige of ancient building visible above ground and every house of the modern village.

The villagers, though liberally compensated, were slow to exchange their old homes for the new settlement built for them half a mile farther down the hill, so that the excavations, inaugurated in October, 1892 and continued leisurely until the following spring, were not seriously taken in hand till April, 1894. Since then, however, they have been actively pushed forward by a force of some three hundred and fifty laborers under the superintendence of M. Homolle, the director of the French School. The steep and uneven configuration of the ground and the deep accumulation of soil presented exceptional difficulties; and the assistance of M. Convert, a distinguished French engineer, was called in for the establishment of an extensive system of inclined tramways, whereby the earth is shot down into the gorge of the Pleistos, while hewn stones and other fragments are set aside until their original position and proper destination can be determined.

The explorers had not proceeded far when they came upon indications of the highest interest. During the preliminary excavations the French had opened up a part of the Sacred Way, the main road leading to the temple, and now they discovered at its lower extremity a structure which originally enclosed the statues of the legendary kings of Argos. The pedestals of the statues were found with the names of Danaus, Hercules, Perseus, etc., written in the primitive style from right to left, apparently with the intention of intensifying the impression of remote antiquity, while the signature of the sculptor, Antiphanes of Argos, is inscribed in the usual way from left to right. As the site of this dedication of the Argives is accurately defined by Pausanias, its discovery served as an important guide to the situation of other monuments. Thus, a small structure measuring ten by six metres only, but of exquisite workmanship, unearthed in June, 1893, was ascertained to be the Treasury of the Athenians. Sculptured fragments and blocks of marble, recovered at considerable distances, were easily identified as parts of this building, both by the style and subject of the sculptures which stood on the metopes, and which referred mostly to Theseus and Hercules, and by the sequence of the inscriptions with which the walls of the Treasury were covered and which

related to Athens and to the part taken by Athenians in the Pythian games. The identity of the building, which can now be almost entirely reconstructed, was finally placed beyond doubt by the words *AΘΕΝΑΙ . . . ΜΑΡΑΘΩ . . .* which formed part of the dedicatory inscription. It determines the date of the building, erected out of the spoils of Marathon at about 485 B.C.; and M. Homolle speaks of its merits as follows:—"I believe I am not exaggerating in characterizing it as a masterpiece of ancient art. I know of no monument of the beginning of the fifth century of a more careful, delicate, and elegant execution." Of no less importance is the certainty with which the date of the sculptures is fixed, whereby the development of Attic art immediately after the battle of Marathon is definitely ascertained.

But by far the greatest prize was the discovery, among the ruins of the Treasury of the Athenians, of certain inscribed fragments the text of which was accompanied by a musical notation. It became at once manifest that the French explorers had had the good luck to recover undoubted original specimens of Greek music; the only other discovery at all comparable to this having been a very short musical inscription found in 1883 by Prof. Ramsay at Tralles, in Asia Minor, on the monument of one Seikilos.

Our knowledge of the music of the Greeks is based principally on the writings of Plato, Aristotële and his pupil Aristoxenos, Euclid, Nicomachos, Aristides Quintilianus, and, more especially, on the valuable treatise of Alypius. These authors supply a complete theory of the art of music; but of its practice with the Greeks there existed, up to the time of these discoveries, no example other than four manuscript fragments, only one of which—the beginning of Pindar's first Pythian ode—claimed to be of the classic period. This was first published by Athanasius Kircher in 1650, but its authenticity has not yet been established. The other three were transcribed from a manuscript in the library of Cardinal Sant' Angiolo and published in 1581 by Vincentio Galilei, father of the great astronomer, and one of the originators of Italian opera. Of these three specimens—which, with all other available information on the subject, are reproduced in Fr. Beltermann's exhaustive work on Greek music—two are hymns to Calliope and Apollo, attributed to Dionysius, an unknown poet said to have lived in the first half of the fourth century of our era. The third and most perfect of all extant specimens is a hymn to Nemesis by Mesomedes, who flourished about the middle of the second century after Christ. These, as well as a very small and uncertain fragment

of the "Orestes" of Euripides (v. 338-343), found among the papyruses of the Archduke Reiner and communicated by Mr. Charles Wessely of Vienna to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres in June, 1892 (published in the "Revue des Études Grecques," V, 265-280, with notes by M. C. E. Ruelle), formed the sum total of our acquaintance with the practice of Greek music.

It is therefore easy to conceive the importance attached to the discovery of the Delphic musical inscriptions. Of these, the one best preserved dates, as the style of the letters indicates, from the third century B.C., is inscribed on a stele, and consists of twelve couplets preceded by a honorific decree in favor of the composer Aristonous. Two other fragments contain the now famous "Hymn to Apollo," which has already become the subject of a considerable body of literature. Its text was first edited by M. Weil,¹ who considers it to have been composed at Athens for the *soteria*, the thanksgiving festival celebrated by the Athenians and the Ætolians in commemoration of the repulse of the Gauls. Their rout at Delphi saved the rest of Greece from invasion; and a *theoria*, or sacred embassy, was deputed by Athens to offer thanksgiving for the intervention of the god, whose victory over the dragon was but the antetype of his annihilation of the barbarians. The poet then sings the praise of Athena and the glory of her immortal city; and at this point the second fragment breaks off. Such is the theme of this grand hymn, which was chanted by the noblest maidens of Athens as they advanced at the head of the procession, past the Castalian spring and up the Sacred Way, to the Shrine of Apollo.

This invaluable find was the fruit of the first autumn's campaign. In the following spring it was found possible to supplement and piece together some twenty other fragments constituting another similar hymn, the last line of which is, in this case, followed by a Delphic decree in honor of the author. This second hymn is also addressed to Apollo, whose protection it invokes for Delphi, for Athens, and for the government of Rome. It, therefore, dates after 145 B.C. when Rome subdued Greece.

The musical notation on all these inscriptions, as in the manuscript specimens above referred to, is expressed by the letters of the Greek alphabet which, when marked upright, inverted, or tilted forward, over the syllables of the text, indicate the various notes. Two sets of such musical symbols were in use with the Greeks: the one was vocal and

¹ "Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique," xvii, 561-583. Also "La Musique des Hymnes de Delphes," by TH. REINACH. *Ibid.* p. 584-610.

is employed in the first; the other, instrumental and figures in the second of the two hymns to Apollo. As, however, the instrumental accompaniment would hardly have been noted at the sacrifice of the song itself, we must infer that not only the voices sang in unison, but that, in this instance at least, instruments and voices were in unison. With the aid of Alypius, M. Theodore Reinach transcribed the earlier of the two hymns into modern notation, although this provides for twelve notes only; whereas the Greeks, with a finer perception of sound, used twenty-one notes within the octave. He was therefore obliged to raise the pitch of some notes, to lower that of others, and even to employ the same modern note in representing two different Greek symbols. These and other conclusions of M. Reinach have been criticised by Mr. Cecil Torr in an able pamphlet just issued,—“On the Interpretation of Greek Music.” However this may be, the hymn discovered and deciphered by the descendants of the invaders whose discomfiture it celebrated, was, for the first time after a lapse of nearly twelve centuries, again sung on March 27, 1894, before the King of the Hellenes, at Athens where it had been originally composed.

A discovery so absorbing in its scientific interest and so striking in its romantic associations could but add to the enthusiasm of the explorers. Their expectations were centred on the site of the great temple of Apollo, which, however, ultimately yielded less than the least sanguine might have hoped. The lines of the foundations were clearly traced, the *adyton* was found marked by a large depression, and the aqueduct, which carried under the temple the waters of the Cassiotis spring, was discovered. Valuable information as to the rebuilding of the temple and its subsequent vicissitudes was also derived from the discovery of another hymn, in honor of Dionysos, dating from the latter part of the fourth century, which, though unaccompanied by musical notation, is full of historic interest. But not a fragment of sculpture and but few pieces of architectural importance have been unearthed. The only explanation seems to be, that some later Roman or Byzantine emperor must have made a clean sweep, not only of the statues and offerings in the temple, but of the sculpture of the pediments, of which Pausanias speaks as the work of Praxias and Androstheneis.

The excavators were, however, repaid in another direction. Important and most valuable remains of three more treasuries were soon found. Opposite the Treasury of the Athenians stood that of the Bœotians; built, in the shape of a Doric temple, of a fine quality of

bluish limestone. The numerous inscriptions which covered the walls, and now help partly to reconstruct them, serve also to identify the building, referring as they do to Bœotian and principally Theban matters. On a commanding position between the two treasuries, and forming with them a large square into which the Sacred Way debouches, rose the Treasury of the Siphnians, the remains of which fully bear out the account of Pausanias as to its splendor and richness. The Siphnians, who had grown wealthy from their gold-mines, kept the oracle in good humor by devoting to it yearly a tenth of their produce. The profuse decoration of the doorways, cornices, and entablatures of their treasury—built entirely of Parian marble—are, in point of conception and execution, fully equal to those of the Erechtheion at Athens; while the sculptures of the extensive frieze,—14 metres in length and 0.65 in height—almost all of which have been recovered and reconstructed, are the most perfect and most beautiful examples we possess of the archaic art of the sixth century at the moment of its development into the unsurpassed style of Phidias. The various mythological subjects represented by these sculptures are no longer a matter of conjecture, since it has been ascertained that the name of each figure was painted above or under it. The paint has disappeared, but the scratches made by the painter for his guidance are still sufficiently distinct to be deciphered with some care. The vigor of conception and the delicacy of execution of the frieze—casts of which are already exhibited at the Louvre—led to the supposition that it was the work of Athenian artists. M. Homolle, however, has, after some difficulty, deciphered an inscription, incised in Argive characters on the shield of one of the figures, which leaves no doubt that these sculptures are of the art of Argos. The figures which adorned the pediment have also been recovered and present many peculiarities. Of a less advanced school of art, they are inferior in technique. The upper part of the figures is cut out in the round, while the lower portion is only in relief. They all bear traces of rich coloring, and the harness, spear, arrow-heads, etc., were in metallic applications. Another treasury, identified as that of the Sicyonians, has been unearthed lower down the Sacred Way. Its sculptured metopes—relating to the legends of the Dioscuri, the Argonauts, and the rape of Europa—are of delicate and careful workmanship of the sixth century; they were originally entirely colored.

Close to the Treasury of the Siphnians four caryatides were discovered. They were at first attributed to that building, but are now believed

to have supported, on the *polos*—the tiara-like head-dress, decorated with delicate reliefs, with which they are crowned—a separate portico or tribune of some kind. They are of an early date, the drapery being treated in the style of the archaic statues of the Acropolis at Athens. A little beyond the Treasury of the Athenians the colossal Sphinx, the emblem of music and prophecy, mentioned by Pausanias as having been dedicated by the Naxians, has been found almost intact and has now been set up again on the imposing monumental column on which it originally stood. The pedestals of the statues of Lysander and his allies, dedicated after the battle of Ægospotamos, have been unearthed; that of Lysander, with the inscription of Ion the Samian, recording the downfall of the power of Athens. The bronze statues themselves were no doubt carried away at an early date. Similar must have been the fate of the statue of Philopoemen, dedicated by the Achæans, the pedestal of which has also been recovered.

The theatre, situated above the temple of Apollo, is in so good a preservation as to rank after that of Epidauros, which is practically intact. In its present condition the building dates from the Roman times. The *stadion*, still higher up the hill, built originally of Parnassus limestone, was reconstructed by Herodes Atticus with marble from Pentelicus. Its exploration, which is still proceeding, has revealed, on one of the blocks of the southern wall, an inscription of the utmost interest, dating from the sixth century. It forbids, under pain of heavy fines, the use of new wine by those training for the foot-races. This and another inscribed decree of the fourth century, relating to a case of bankruptcy, fixing the rate of interest, and regulating the mode of lending money, are among the most remarkable of the rich and voluminous body of Delphic inscriptions, several of which were found imbedded in the pavement of the Sacred Way.

Of isolated works of art the most noticeable are a very fine marble statue of Antinous, almost intact, and an archaic Apollo of proportions sufficiently colossal to have made it serve as a buttress to a terrace wall of later date. The signature of the sculptor “. . . medes of Argos,” is legible on its base. Another statue of Apollo, of like style and dimensions, was found close by; and the two are supposed to have been part of the offering of the Lipari islanders in commemoration of their victory over the Tyrrhenians. Two more archaic Apollos (one somewhat mutilated), a Doryphorus, and a cow, of exquisite workmanship and almost perfect in preservation, are among the smaller bronzes secured.

But by far the greatest treasure which the excavations have so far yielded is a bronze statue 1.78 metres in height, unearthed last April. It represents a young man clothed in a *chiton* reaching to the feet and girdled at the waist, with sleeves half-way down the elbows. The right arm is extended, the hand holding the reins of a chariot. With the exception of the naked portion of the left arm, which is missing, the statue is absolutely perfect, and has a beautiful patina. The hair, curly and somewhat long, is bound with a diadem. The features, though reposeful, are animated by an expression of pride and joy; and the eyes, set in enamel, give a startling, life-like look to a work which, in its serene and somewhat archaic treatment, impresses the observer as the creation of a great artist. This impression is heightened by its dimensions, it being the largest Greek bronze statue extant. It is cast in four pieces, which fit together at the girdle and under the folds of the sleeves with such nicety that they have been united without leaving any perceptible trace of juncture. Close by this statue portions of the hind legs and the tail of a horse have been found, leaving no doubt that they are all parts of a group representing the victor in a chariot-race. M. Homolle was not long in fixing upon Hiero as the victor thus commemorated. He is generally held to have won several races at both the Olympian and the Pythian games, and certain inscriptions unearthed in the vicinity seem to convert this supposition into a certainty, and to point to Ageladas—a Peloponnesian sculptor who had executed several works for the Despots of Syracuse and flourished between 470 and 460 B.C.—as the sculptor of the statue in question. Though these conclusions have been disputed in detail by M. Foucard, of the Académie des Inscriptions, the French are not unreasonably elated by the fact that their exploration of Delphi has yielded as great a work of ancient art as the *Hermes* of Praxiteles, found by the Germans at Olympia.

These excavations, the total cost of which is likely to exceed \$200,000, will, it is expected, be brought to a close next year.

The more varied but no less important work carried on in Greece by the American School of Archæology at Athens will form the subject of a separate article.

J. GENNADIUS.

BOND SALES AND THE GOLD STANDARD.

No part of the campaign against sound money has been conducted with greater bitterness than the outcry against the bond sales by the Treasury. The allegation is made that, under the gold standard, our monetary system is controlled by a plutocracy; and proof of this is supposed to be found in the successive bond issues for the maintenance of the gold reserve. These inure to the profit of bankers and brokers, increase the national debt, and bring humiliation to the Government. Bond syndicates and Jewish bankers are said to control the Administration,—even to have bought it. Much of this talk is mere froth, undeserving of a serious answer; but much of it reflects a general uneasiness as to the meaning of the recurring demands for financial aid. It is hardly to be doubted that the Silverites have found here some effective ammunition.

In truth, the situation during the last few years has been neither comfortable for the Treasury officials nor consistent with the pride and dignity of a great Government. The Treasury has been in fact reduced to straits in order to keep intact its gold reserve and to maintain its general solvency. It has been in the position of a suppliant; it has had to ask aid and forbearance; and on at least one occasion (when the bond-syndicate contract of February, 1895, was made) it has been compelled to accept almost any terms which the great financial houses were disposed to offer. All these shifts—humiliating to the Government of a rich and prosperous people—have been necessitated by the determination of the Administration to maintain gold payments. It is natural that they should be associated with the gold standard, and should draw invectives from the silver side. Even persons who have no sympathy with the general position of the silver men, shake their heads over the gold loans, and wish that the policy which they support were not encumbered with these unfortunate and unpopular transactions.

The truth is, however, that the bond sales have nothing whatever to do with the gold standard in itself. They are the final outcome of a series of legislative experiments reaching a long way back in the past; and they are the consequence, not of the maintenance of the gold

standard, but of the fact that the gold standard has failed to be consistently and effectively maintained. In the immediate past, they are due quite as much to the endeavor to force the country to a silver basis as to the endeavor to keep it on a gold basis.

To make clear the grounds upon which this statement is made, it will be necessary to explain the history and the present position of the Treasury of the United States, and to point out how, from time to time, extraordinary duties and responsibilities have been thrown on an institution which was not originally designed, nor at any time adequately equipped, to meet them.

The Treasury of the United States was created by the act of 1846, establishing the independent treasury. Before that date, the Government had kept its funds in banks, and had disbursed them by orders on banks. During two periods it had used great financial institutions of its own creation,—the two Banks of the United States (1791–1811 and 1817–1837). These had proved of great fiscal advantage; but they aroused political jealousies and difficulties which proved them ill-adapted to our democratic ways. During two other periods it had used many scattered banks, chartered by the several States; but these had proved not only a source of political evil, but of financial loss as well. Finally, in 1846, it was decided that the Government should break loose from all banking institutions. It established a Treasury of its own, kept its own cash, disbursed its payments for itself. It refused to recognize the very existence of banking. It would take no bank-notes, and make no bank-deposits. It would receive nothing but specie. Its sole monetary function was to coin specie,—and specie then meant, practically, gold alone. Strange to say, this Treasury, designed to be absolutely divorced from all banking operations, and to recognize not even the existence of paper money, has become inextricably involved in the financial machinery of the country, and is the largest issuer of paper money in the world!

The first and most momentous step in this transformation was taken during the civil war, when the issue of Government paper—the present United States notes, or greenbacks—began. The resource was at the time expected to be temporary,—a war measure, to be repealed when peace should come. But excessive issues and the inflation which they caused had the usual effect,—they created the appetite for more. All industrial ills were ascribed to lack of currency, and a strong party arose which sought to cure depression by having not less paper money, but more. The struggle between sound money and

inflation ended for a while, as political struggles so often end, in a compromise. On the one hand, the Resumption Act of 1875 provided that the Government should pay its notes, whenever presented, in specie,—which was then understood on all hands to mean gold. On the other hand, an act of 1878 provided that notes so paid in specie should not be destroyed, but should be paid out again, and thus should remain permanent obligations of the Treasury. Hence, when resumption finally was undertaken in 1879, the Treasury was saddled with a new duty,—the redemption of a great mass of paper money; while it still remained in its organization simply the receiver of the taxes and the disburser of the public payments.

The obligations put on the Treasury by the peculiar manner in which resumption was attempted (and by good fortune effected) in 1875-79 were further increased by the silver issues of 1878 and 1890. The struggle between sound money and depreciated money took a new form after 1875; it was no longer a question whether our paper money should rest on specie, but on what kind of specie it should rest. The old inflationist movement was adroitly turned into the silver channel, where it had the additional support of the silver-mining interests. The compromise in the Resumption Act, like most compromises, ended the contest for the movement, but settled nothing. It was followed by the others of 1878 and 1890. The Bland Act of 1878 provided—as a compromise with the demand for free coinage of silver—an annual coinage of silver, limited but continuing. In the form of silver dollars and silver certificates it added an accumulating mass of money, whose solidity depended on the general maintenance of gold payments by the Treasury. Though nominally based on silver, the issues under the act of 1878 were virtually paper money resting on a gold basis. The so-called Sherman Act of 1890 added another monetary accumulation; this time in the shape of direct Treasury notes, identical in legal effect with the old United States notes. They are a perfect legal tender; they are redeemable in “coin”; yet with a formal pledge for the maintenance of “parity,” *i. e.*, for keeping the silver as good as the gold.

The repeal, in 1893, of the silver-purchase and note-issue provisions of the act of 1890, put an end at last to the growth of the money which the Treasury was under obligations to keep equal to gold; but not before it had swelled to portentous dimensions. Taking the figures as they stood on August 1 of the present year, we have—

United States notes (Greenbacks).....	346.7	millions of	dollars
Treasury notes of 1890.....	128.8	"	"
Silver dollars and certificates.....	431.8	"	"
Total.....	906.8	"	"

Add to this the subsidiary silver coins, amounting to \$76,000,000; the National-Bank notes, \$226,000,000;—both dependent for their value on the quality of the legal-tender money which the Government supplies,—and the mass of currency for whose solidity the Treasury is directly or indirectly responsible is seen to be so huge that even with the best organization and the widest powers its task must have been a hard one.

So far, however, from having an organization and powers adapted to its overgrown responsibilities, the Treasury is still, nominally, the independent Treasury of 1846. It is still the sole depository (with some minor exceptions not important for the present purpose) of the public receipts; it still disburses the public payments. What is more important, there is no distinction between these simple fiscal functions and its more complicated functions as the issuer and supporter of more than a thousand millions of paper money. Its assets serve indifferently to pay the current expenses of the Government and to redeem paper money when presented for payment. If it happens to have an excess of tax receipts over ordinary payments, it is by so much in a stronger position as a bank of issue. If its ordinary payments are greater than its inflowing tax receipts, its cash on hand, *i. e.*, the supply of gold which constitutes its reserve as a bank of issue, must meet the deficiency.

The dangers and anomalies of this situation are increased by the fact that the national revenue is derived in largest part from the tariff, and fluctuates greatly with changes in imports. Much has been said of late years as to the effect of tariff legislation on revenue. But more important than tariff legislation—so far as revenue is concerned—are those ups and downs in imports which take place under any tariff system. When trade is good, imports are high, and the customs revenue swells. When there is depression, imports fall, and the customs revenue declines. As between the McKinley tariff of 1890 and the Wilson tariff of 1894, there would be no great difference, under normal conditions, in revenue-yielding effect: the former yielded revenue enough simply because it was in force at a time when imports were large; the latter has failed to yield enough because during the last three years trade has been depressed and imports have been small. If the Republicans had been victorious in 1892, their Adminis-

tration, under the McKinley tariff act, would have been confronted in 1893 with precisely the same difficulties that President Cleveland's Administration had to face. The Republican party has been lucky in many ways; but nothing more lucky ever happened in its history than its defeat in 1892. The underlying cause of trouble—which the party was fortunate in not having to face—was the radically vicious system, or lack of system, under which the Treasury was burdened with enormous responsibilities, though provided only with slender and irregular resources.

Hence the straits of the Treasury; hence the difficult struggle to maintain gold payments of outstanding paper money; hence the bond sales; hence the popular association of the gold standard with syndicates and loans and bankers' profits and an increase in the national debt. So short is the memory of man, and so easily forgotten are events even of the immediate past, that the present position of the Government Treasury with reference to the gold standard is thought of as part of the natural course of things. Yet that position never was deliberately planned; it is the result of wavering legislation, guided by no principle; and the significant thing is, not that the Treasury should have had to make strenuous endeavors to maintain gold payments, but that, with all the difficulties, the gold standard should have been successfully upheld.

If recrimination were profitable, it might be retorted to the silver men that their demands, not the gold standard, have caused the Treasury's embarrassments and the bond sales. It is the silver issues, and especially those under the act of 1890, which have caused the money dependent on the Treasury for its maintenance at par with gold to swell to such excessive proportions. If squabbling between the two political parties of old were in order, it might be said that the Republicans should be held mainly responsible for the present perplexing situation. They certainly cannot plume themselves on having no responsibility for the Government's ill plight; for it was they who passed the Resumption Act in the form which put upon the Treasury its momentous obligations, and it was they who engineered the compromises of 1878 and 1890, by which those obligations were so greatly increased. But it is more just, and more helpful for an understanding of the real difficulties of the situation, to point out that the whole series of measures was the natural result of that tendency to compromise which is inevitable in popular government. Compromise is sometimes healthy; but it is never decisive. Either the dispute is

settled by time in favor of one side or the other, or it comes to a head in the end. As the compromises with slavery in 1820 and 1850 availed nothing, and only made the final struggle more bitter, the eventual problem harder, so the currency compromises of 1875, 1878, 1890, have only deferred and made more difficult the real settlement, which now has come before the people as suddenly and as peremptorily as the question of union or disunion did in 1861.

In regard to the forms and terms of the bond sales, it may be said with perfect truth that the embarrassments under which the Administration has labored in effecting them have been greatly increased by the opposition of the silver party. All the bond issues have been made under the general authorization contained in the Resumption Act of 1875,—a measure passed when financial conditions were very different from those of the present, and enacted, moreover, with a view rather to the original acquisition of a fund of specie by the Treasury than to its permanent maintenance. The only forms of bonds allowed bear a rate of interest which is high, in view of the present credit of the Government; and they run for a considerable stretch of time, and so necessitate an increase of debt in comparatively permanent form. They must be either 5 per cents running ten years, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cents running fifteen years, or 4 per cents running thirty years. The Administration has repeatedly asked for authority to borrow in a simpler and easier way, by short-time loans at a low rate of interest; but the silver element, while not strong enough to carry its own measures, has been strong enough to block those of the other side. Since 1893, there has been a complete deadlock in monetary legislation,—a deadlock which can only close when once the fundamental question between a gold standard and a silver standard shall have been decided. Meanwhile, the Administration has been compelled to resort to the antiquated forms of borrowing authorized in 1875. The management of all the loans thus made may not have been perfect; but when one considers the extraordinary difficulties of the case,—the fiscal deficit, the industrial depression, the shattering of general confidence, the huge mass of Government paper to be maintained,—it must be admitted that the Treasury Administration has not only shown great courage and a high purpose, but has succeeded in overcoming difficulties well-nigh insurmountable.

But, to repeat, the bond sales have not been the result of the gold standard: they have been the result of the struggle to maintain the gold standard under peculiarly difficult conditions. Had we settled

our currency simply and definitively on a gold basis fifteen or twenty years ago, these loans and negotiations would never have appeared. Even now, the quantity of gold in the country would probably suffice, under wise legislation, as the foundation for all the currency we need. Certainly it would be an easy matter to secure from abroad or from our own mines such moderate additional amount as would be required. But to bring about a solid and satisfactory gold basis, we must overhaul completely our present currency system. The Government paper should be reduced in volume; safest and best of all, it should be got rid of entirely. If the paper is to be retained, something more is necessary to put it in some half-way satisfactory condition than that increase in the public revenue which many of the Republican leaders make so much of. The fiscal weakness of the Treasury is easily mended: a simple revival of business, such as is likely to come after these years of depression, will bring a growth of imports and a gain in revenue sufficient to wipe out the deficit. But the whole system by which monetary stability is made to depend on the current revenue of a Government having a budget as irregular as ours should be abolished. The Treasury, if it is to remain an issuer of paper money, must have that function completely separated from its mere fiscal duties. The safest policy, as I have said, and that which offers least risk, and temptation for future currency tinkering, is to get rid of Government paper entirely, and to replace this inert and dangerous form of paper money with elastic bank-notes, resting solidly and directly on gold reserves held by the banks. But this is a matter for the future, and needs more detailed consideration than the limits of the present discussion permit. If, as we may hope, the silver cause is soundly beaten in the coming election, it will be necessary to set our house in order,—a hard task, not likely to be accomplished satisfactorily for a long time to come. Meanwhile, let us remember that our recent and present embarrassments have been our own fault, and are not any necessary or natural concomitants of the gold standard. We have made hazardous currency experiments, and we have had to struggle hard to avert disaster. We have simply reaped what we have sown. Let us sow better seed in the future; confident that with wise preparation and conservative management we may in due time reap a healthy crop.

F. W. TAUSSIG.

EMERSON'S WIT AND HUMOR.

ON the Pacific coast in 1871 Emerson met John Muir, who has since written "The Mountains of California," every leaf of it a leaf of nature. Muir had read the rocks, streams, and forests of his Eldorado, as Emerson the leaves in the libraries of Boston. He led Emerson as no one else could have done through the valley of the Yosemite and the passes of the Sierras. The two guides—such both were—explored each other as well as the scenes through which they were going. Emerson said that Muir was another Thoreau. Muir was felicitous in replying with an inspiration caught from the grandest trees of the grandest flora in the world. "Emerson," he said, "is the Sequoia of mankind." Speaking of these forest sublimities in his book, Muir points out that the beauty of their proportions is so perfect that the onlooker finds it impossible to realize the size of their different parts, except by actual measurements. Certainly nothing is farther from the common idea of Emerson than that he was a wit and a humorist. This part of our "Sequoia" is a limb which, to be seen for what it is, needs to be separated from a whole too great and harmonious for partial effects. But his audiences followed his lectures with laughter and smiles. Apt quotations from him get quick recognition of the same kind to-day from public and private gatherings.

Oliver Wendell Holmes recognized in Emerson a brother wit of the first water. No one who is not sensitive to humor should venture on Emerson, he says. "If not laughter, there is," thinks Morley, "at least gaiety in every piece." "His fine humor," says Conway. Lowell, in "My Study Windows," commemorates Emerson's "glance of humor"; his biographer Cooke, "his keen and ready wit"; F. B. Sanborn, "the salt of his wit"; Harriet Martineau, "his exquisite sense of humor." Tyndall found "immortal laughter" in his poetry—"in his case Poetry with the joy of a Bacchanal takes her graver brother Science by the hand, and cheers him with immortal laughter." This enthusiastic language might well apply to the last two lines of the famous prelude to Emerson's essay on "Nature," published in 1836, twenty-three years before Darwin's "Origin of Species":—

"And striving to be man the worm
Mounts through all the spires of form."

In the shrewd face which looks upon us out of his portraits we see that there is that sense—that saving sense—which can detect the ridiculous side—the other side—of anybody or anything. None of their commemorators has said more reverential words of the Puritans than he. But he passes in one sentence from an almost choral admiration of the religious pleasure with which they read for daily food such authors as Milton, Flavel, Bunyan, to the anti-climax of the remark of an old lady who remembered them as being so pious that "they had to hold on hard to the huckleberry bushes to hinder themselves from being translated." He could illuminate the subject of religion as well by a stroke of wit as by the solemn and tender passages of his "Divinity School Address." "All the religions," he held, "are one wine in different colored glasses." In the same manner, he said: "There is but one standard English novel, like the one orthodox sermon which with slight variation is repeated every Sunday from so many pulpits." Cabot quotes him as writing about "the prevailing Boston beverage of Channing and water." "The Church"—he is speaking of the English Church—"has nothing left but possession. If a bishop meets an intelligent gentleman, and reads fatal interrogation in his eyes, he has no resource but to take wine with him." "The clergyman who would live in the city *may* have piety, but he *must* have taste."

On a certain Sunday morning which he spent in Stratford Church, Emerson remained beside Shakespeare's grave throughout the service. The English friend who went with him was ashamed of the sermon, which was very poor. He was relieved when Emerson asked quaintly, "Did he preach?" Happily perceiving what Emerson meant he replied, "Who? Shakespeare?" "Yes," replied Emerson. Pope taught that "discord" was "harmony not understood." Emerson was of this philosophy, which is older than Pope. He called the devil "the great second best." "If Emerson went to hell," said his friend Father Taylor, of the Sailor Mission, "the devil would not know what to do with him. The climate would change and emigration would set that way."

Disraeli, Sir William Fraser tells us in his gossipy reminiscences, had an elaborate code of signals to give notice to his audience that a joke was coming. His well-trained hearers in the House of Commons would begin to laugh in anticipation as they saw his handkerchief travel, stage by stage, from his pocket to the tip of his nose, where

he kept the point of his witticisms, as Herrmann, the magician, uses the same organ as a never-failing fountain of eggs, watches, playing-cards, and rabbits. But in the best wit it is always the unexpected that happens. Emerson gives no notice, does not affect to be a wit, and slips from grave to gay and back again in a flash. He begins solemnly, "The mysteries of creation";—"known only to the pious," he concludes. He made merry with Swedenborg's intimate knowledge of these "mysteries" and declared that his carefully elaborated angels looked as stiff as country parsons. There were other things more important than angels. "An actually-existent fly is more important than a possibly-existent angel." His scepticism about angels extended to the plans of aerial navigators that men should imitate angelic methods of locomotion. "We are not yet ripe," he said, "to be birds."

The wit is even more judicial than the judge who knows neither friends nor enemies. The wit must know both his friends and enemies, and himself who is of both these. Emerson said of himself, "I am always insincere as always knowing that there are other moods." He did not spare himself. He did not spare his own craft. "There is indeed this vice about men of thought, that you cannot quite trust them. . . . They have a hankering to play Providence, and make a distinction in favor of themselves from the rules they apply to the human race." We can see what he meant when we open our Renan, and read where, under the certainly inapt title, "Intellectual and Moral Reform," Renan says in substance to the Church: Leave us literary men alone and we will leave you alone with the people—a passage not too sharply criticized by Mazzini as the most singular and the most immoral compromise that could enter into the brain of a thinker.

In the eye twinkling through Emerson's pages we get the clue which many of his would-be critics have missed. Having no sense of humor concealed about their persons, as he had, they did not detect that he was laughing, if not at them, at their kind. Expressions at which they brayed in terror were not the extravagancies they took them to be, but the broad strokes of an imagination translucent with the inner flames of wit. His one subject, as he put it, was, in all his lectures, "the infinitude of the private man." He has uttered this thought of the partnership of man in the creative power in many inspired passages which have become familiar quotations. But he had more than one way of expressing this thought. Looking out of a window at a winter storm, he once said, as a friend of his told me, "I snow."

Emerson's utterances on Immortality have taken their place among the litanies of sacred anthology. A well-known literary woman of Chicago having heard the reports, current some years ago, of a reaction in his opinions said to him, "Mr. Emerson, you do believe in the immortality of the soul, do you not?" In his essay, whose sentences go sounding on like organ chords, Emerson makes Yama, the Hindoo god of Death, say: "The soul is not born; it does not die; . . . unborn, eternal, it is not slain, though the body is slain; subtler than what is subtle, greater than what is great, sitting it goes far, sleeping it goes everywhere." It had been with such majestic notes that she had been filling her ears. It may well be believed that she was unprepared for the rapid transition in the tone of her oracle, who parried her with, "Madam, we are not swill." For he was no *poseur*; he would not "show off," nor act the augur, and he would take any liberty with words that his audacity or wit or gaiety might prompt. His mind was not only original but, as E. P. Whipple said of it, "aboriginal." Alternation of the currents in the brain as in the dynamo is the invariable accompaniment of power. The great orator swings his audience from tears to laughter, not from the calculated use of contrasts but in obedience to a law of emotion which rules him as he rules his audience.

It was the heat of his high combustion that condensed Emerson's sentences, as he described them, into paragraphs infinitely repellent, "incompressible." It is this which makes him the most quotable of writers. You can find in him the philosophies packed into phrases. We are not in the habit of thinking of scholars and poets as men of high vitality. Rather they have the reputation of being of a low tone physically. But performance is the nigh horse of power, and this low tone of a great author usually evidences not a lack of physical power, but diversion of energy to inner channels. "Health is the first wealth," Emerson said, and one of the secrets of his style is the exuberant spring that rose within him, and overflowed in an affluent stream. It was from this he got the joy of life that bubbled up in his deportment in a perpetual serenity, in his philosophy in common sense, and in his working power in an affluence which had no thought of an eight-hour day but produced during almost every waking moment. "Every man would be a poet," he says, "if his digestion were perfect," and again, "The work of the writer needs a frolic health." Emerson, delicate as he seemed, could eat pie every day, having it always for the first thing at breakfast, and he never had indigestion. To most of us this would be a frolic health indeed.

"How can Mr. Emerson," said one of the younger members of the party with which he made the trip in California, "be so agreeable all the time without getting tired?" His balance was moral as well as physical and mental. It is quite scientific to attribute his goodness as also his good humor largely to the same health which gave him the power of continuous literary production and made him equal at an advanced age to arduous journeys in snow and ice in Michigan and Illinois to fulfil lecture engagements. Health is not only the first wealth, as he says, but the first piety. His sanity or soundness ran through his whole nature. His too brief Boswell, Mr. Woodberry, is not afraid to say that Emerson probably did not know in his own experience what sin was as other men know it. If we pass that by as the admiration of the worshipper, we find the critical Henry James the elder, in his "Literary Remains," drawing the portrait with the same halo. Carlyle must have felt the same thing, for on one occasion he refused to precede Emerson to the dinner-table. "I am too wicked," he said. This is but to say that in his case sanity, or soundness, had evolved itself up to sanctity, and it would not be easy to see why it should not have done so in his case, or why we should not all believe that to be the common destiny. "What one is why may not millions be?" asks Wordsworth. Emerson felt that sickness and wickedness were one and the same. "One sometimes suspects," he put it, "that outer have something to do with inner complaints, and, when one is ill, something the devil's the matter." No machinery could throw him out of employment. He would come back from a walk with a pocket full of little bits of paper on which he had jotted down things that had come to him, as Sir Walter Scott used to return from an expedition in the Highlands quizzing lairds or picking up ballads with a handful of twigs whose notches and crooks were memoranda to be transcribed into a "Waverley," or some "Canto of the Lakes."

The gaiety of health and strength which expressed itself in other men in exuberance of spirits came out in Emerson in exuberance of phrase. The feeble pulse of the didactic exhorter says, "Aim high," but Emerson, the earth light under his happy feet, cries, "Hitch your wagon to a star." So in another address he says the time will come when "we shall be willing to sow the sun and the moon for seeds." He was almost French in his dislike of dull expression. For commonplace phrases about the "Unity of Nature," he substitutes, "The tree is rooted man," or, "The musk-rat is man modified to live

in a mud-bank," or, "Yonder mountain must migrate into your mind." When he wants to tell what *Podsnap* would wave away as, "The universal social unrest," he says: "Nowadays every man carries a revolution in his vest-pocket." "The transfusion of the blood," he says, "it is claimed in Paris, will enable a man to change his blood as often as his linen." He quotes another Parisian fancy that by electro-magnetism our salads shall be grown from the seeds while our fowl is roasting, and dismisses it thus, "Nothing is gained, nature cannot be cheated. Man's life is but seventy salads long, grow they swift or grow they slow." Speaking of the resistance of the party of property to every progressive step, he said: "They would nail the stars to the sky." To make the living virtue of his beloved Montaigne's style comprehended, he says: "Cut these words and they would bleed." Many writers have described the insularity of the English. He brings the metaphor buried in that word to life again. "Every one of these islanders is an island himself." He contrasts French love of display with English love of reality. "A Frenchman invented the dickey, an Englishman added the shirt." It was his frolic health of mind, or, as he said of his friend Carlyle, "this glad and needful venting of his redundant spirits," from which came the felicities, paradoxes, contradictions, he revelled in. "Consistency" he thought to be "the bugbear of small minds." He would say on one page, "Solitude is impracticable, and society fatal," and on another, "He only who is able to stand alone is fit for society." He saw everything in flight, even truth. "The truest state of mind, rested in, becomes false."

Emerson, the reformer, descendant of reformers, inspiring spirit of reform, shot some of his sharpest shafts at reformers. He was a reformer, but he was also a wit. All great wits, from Aristophanes to "Mark Twain," have been reformers, but, alas! all reformers are not wits. Emerson had that love of fun, that insight into the absurd, that sharp ear for the other side, that detective eye for humbug, which makes the wit, and makes the wit the most dangerous enemy of the wrongdoer. In his day in New England the air fairly sizzled with unrest. Every accepted idea, every established institution, every conventional-ity, had its assailant. It was a time when, as he puts it, "The young men seemed to have been born with knives in their brains." Through this whirl of agitation Emerson held his way, sympathetic but smiling, never off his feet or out of his head. Morley thinks that in him was realized Hawthorne's hope in the "Blithedale Romance" that "out of the very thoughts that were wildest and most destructive might grow

a wisdom holy, calm, and pure, and that should incarnate itself with the substance of a noble and happy life." "In the person of Emerson," declares Morley, "this ferment and dissolvency of thought worked itself out in a strain of wisdom of the highest and purest." Emerson was able to run these intellectual rapids without slipping back into the doubt, aversion, and reaction that caught Burke, Wordsworth, and Tennyson.

Speaking of the enthusiasts who were then discussing the plans that ended in Brook Farm, Emerson wrote to Carlyle: "One man renounced the use of animal food, another of coin, another of domestic hired service, and another of the state, and on the whole we have a commendable share of reason and hope." "I am," he says, "gently mad myself, and am resolved to live cleanly." We recognize his pen in the description in "The Dial" of one of the characteristic conventions of that period, one of many then meeting in Boston. This gathering of 1840 called itself the "Friends of Universal Progress." "There were in it," says Emerson, "many persons whose church was a church of one member only." "Madmen, mad-women, men with beards, Dunkers, Mugglestonians, Come-Outers, Groaners, Agrarians, Seventh-Day Baptists, Quakers, Abolitionists, Calvinists, Unitarians, and philosophers all came successively to the top, and seized their moment, if not their hour, wherein to chide, or pray, or preach, or protest." One woman, who was always jumping up with a roll of manuscript in these conventions, he styles "that flea of conventions." "Even the insect world was to be defended. That had been too long neglected, and a society for the protection of ground-worms, slugs, and mosquitoes was to be incorporated without delay." Reporting upon these swimmers—these fellow-swimmers—in "the storm-engendering sea of liberty," Emerson made the remark: "There is nothing a reformer hates so much as—another reformer." And with quite as much pungency, he laid it down that "Society gains nothing whilst a man not himself renovated attempts to renovate things around him." He gives a related idea an equally felicitous expression, when he says, "There can be no concert in two, where there is no concert in one." "I go to a convention of philanthropists. Do what I will, I cannot keep my eyes off the clock." "The reformers," he said, "bite us and we run mad too."

These gentle recalls to reason are the notes of a friend, not of an enemy. The reformers smiled at themselves with their critic, a privileged character, for he had been the first American scholar of his generation to thrust his pen into the heart of slavery.

What Holmes so happily calls the inward inaudible laughter of Emerson, "more refreshing than the explosion of our noisiest humorists," is to be seen in his account of Brook Farm. "The married women were against the community. . . . The Common School was well enough, but to the common nursery they had grave objections. Eggs might be hatched in ovens, but the hen on her own account much preferred the old way." He describes the community as "a perpetual picnic, a French Revolution in small, an Age of Reason in a patty-pan." It was a paradise of shepherds and shepherdesses, but, "The ladies took cold on washing-day, and it was ordained that the gentlemen-shepherds should hang out the clothes, but—in the evening when they began to dance the clothes-pins dropped from their pockets."

No weapons have cut deeper into the public enemy than those of the leaders who know how to make the people smile while kindling their wrath. In his speech on affairs in Kansas, Emerson fetched one of these strokes. "The President says, 'Let the complainants go to the Courts.' He knows that when the poor plundered farmer comes to the court, he finds the ringleader who has robbed him, dismounting from his horse, and unbuckling his knife to sit as his judge." He could turn on the farmer too. Writing to Carlyle of the "honest solid farmers" of America, he said, "Horace Greeley does their thinking for them at a dollar a head."

When Choate belittled the Declaration of Independence as made up of "glittering generalities," Emerson retorted, "I call them, rather, blazing ubiquities." Mrs. Carlyle said that Carlyle's love of silence was entirely Platonic. But there was no lack of performance in Emerson's love of utterance. He smote, when need was, with a hammer as heavy as Thor's. He loved Webster, and no finer characterizations than his have been made of the great man, all whose dimensions, as Emerson put it, were such as to make him the personification of the American continent. But when Webster voted for the Fugitive Slave Bill, Emerson spoke in words that still bite. "Every drop of Webster's blood," he said, "has eyes that look downward." Such fierceness is rare in his humor. One more instance of it is in "English Traits," where the rampant and couchant glories of the coats-of-arms of the English nobility are given a turn not to be found in the philosophy of the Heralds' College. After describing "the twenty thousand thieves who landed at Hastings" with William the Conqueror "as greedy and ferocious pirates," who "burned, harried, violated, tortured,

and killed," he turns his pen in the wound he has made. "Such however is the illusion of antiquity and wealth that decent and dignified men now existing boast their descent from these filthy thieves, who showed a far juster conviction of their own merits by assuming for their types the swine, goat, jackal, leopard, wolf, and snake, which they severally resembled."

Emerson was so far from seeking effect that, as Conway found, in printing his essays he would omit passages which when spoken had made a laugh. Thus he left out of his paper on "Superlatives" a remark about oaths which had greatly entertained his audience, to the effect that the oath could be used by a thinking man only in some great moral emergency. He meant his wit to be the sauce, not the roast; a touch of nature, not the intellectual elephantiasis of the professional. His opinion of the class known as "men of wit" is given in his new book, "The Natural History of the Intellect." "There is really a grievous amount of unavailableness about men of wit. A plain man finds them so heavy, dull, and oppressive with bad jokes, and conceit, and stupefying individualism that he comes to write in his tablets." He gives another slap at this class in his essay on "Clubs." "Things are in pairs. . . . A story is matched by another story, and that may be the reason why when a gentleman has told a good thing, he immediately tells it again." This was not the Puritan in him preferring the frown to the laugh. He never frowned; he was, as Mr. Mangasarian has so well said, "the smile of the century." He believed that "a rogue alive to the ludicrous is still convertible." He called "the perception of the comic a balance-wheel in our metaphysical structure." Nothing in Carlyle appeals more to Emerson than his wit—his "playing of tunes," as this fellow-wit most keenly characterized it, "with a whip-lash like some renowned charioteer." "We have had nothing in literature so like earthquakes," he says, "as the laughter of Carlyle. . . . These jokes shake down Parliament House and Windsor Castle, Temple and Tower, and the future shall echo the dangerous peals."

With the same feeling that led him to strike out some of the laughable passages, and made him unwilling to play the man of wit, he always used a quiet note in referring to his own work. When he speaks of giving a course of lectures, he calls it beginning to "sell tickets again," or going "peddling with my literary pack of notions." One reason perhaps why Emerson was so agreeable was this reserve and refinement of his humor. He disliked loud laughter. He came to have a

great friendship for Margaret Fuller, but it had to conquer a strong feeling he at first had against her because she made him laugh more than he liked. He was very seldom heard to laugh. His laugh, as Prof. Thayer describes it, was "a quiet ground-swell." To force a laugh from his readers would have been not to be Emerson. "True wit," he said, "never made us laugh." His sparks fly only when his mind is working at a high heat. His letters seldom reach this level, unlike Lowell's, which bubble and sparkle at every turn with fun which sometimes is all the more agreeable because so obviously produced like ice at New Orleans, artificially, and with the set purpose to be agreeable.

Similarly there was little drollery in Emerson's conversation, though it had a sweetness which the testimony of a cloud of witnesses makes it not extravagant to call ineffable. But we get a touch of fun once in a while. A pleasantry recorded of him is a story he told of a friend who carried a horse-chestnut to protect him from rheumatism. "He has never had it since he began to carry it, and indeed it appears to have had a retrospective operation, for he never had it before." An English friend tells me that while with Mr. Emerson in his garden discussing some problem of life, Mrs. Emerson called to him for some wood. Emerson went to the wood-pile; when he came back he said, with his wonderful smile, "Now we will return to the real things." When Oliver Wendell Holmes asked him if he had any manual dexterity, he illustrated his want of it by replying, that he could split a shingle four ways with one nail. "Which," says Dr. Holmes, "as the intention is not to split it at all in fastening it to the roof, I took to be a confession of inaptitude for mechanical work." In later years he lost his memory of the names of things. Once he wanted his umbrella, but could not recall the word. But he got around the difficulty. "I can't tell its name, but I can tell its history. Strangers take it away." His daughter ran in one day to ask who should be invited to join their berry-picking party. "All the children," he said, "from six years to sixty." Equally tender is the humor of this in the essay on "Illusions": "When the boys come into my yard for leave to gather horse-chestnuts, I enter into nature's game, and affect to grant the permission reluctantly, fearing that any moment they will find out the imposture. . . . But this tenderness is quite unnecessary; the enchantments are laid on very thick."

This recluse could sit in his garden at Concord or wander along the shores of Walden and see into the penetralia of Vanity Fair quite

as keenly as the clubmen of Michigan Avenue or Piccadilly. He was once asked if he approved of Platonic friendship between men and women. "Yes," he said, "but—hands off!" Once when Emerson was in Chicago to lecture to its Fortnightly Club of women, its president said to him, "It is too bad you were not here last week, Mr. Emerson. We were discussing Goethe's 'Elective Affinities,' and would have been so glad to get your views." Emerson bowed with gracious silence. "What would you have said to us about it?" the lady persisted. "Madam," he replied, "I have never felt that I had attained to the purity of mind that qualified me to read that book."

We all know the kind of men he described as those who "seem to steal their own dividends," and the kind of girl like *Lillian* who "began the world with a cold in her head and has been adding to it ever since." Of the type Disraeli chose for the hero of "*Vivian Grey*," Emerson said: "They never sleep, go nowhere, stay nowhere, eat nothing, and know nobody, but are up to anything though it were the genesis of nature or the last cataclysm. Festus-like, Faust-like, Jove-like, they could write an *Iliad* any rainy morning if fame were not such a bore." Very delicate but very penetrating is his characterization of a certain class of the American youth, who are "converted into pale caryatides to uphold the temple of conventions."

He did not care much for metaphysics. "Who has not looked into a metaphysical book, and what sensible man ever looked twice?" He wanted only a teaspoonful a year of its crop of pepper, and he added, "I admire the Dutch who burned half the harvest to enhance the price of the remainder."

There has already come to be an Emerson legend, like the Lincoln legend, grave and gay. This legend is the repository of the familiar story that having gone together to see Fanny Elssler dance, Margaret Fuller said to Emerson, "This is poetry!" and he replied, "It is religion!" Legend also attributes to Emerson the maxim that the consciousness of being well-dressed gives one a moral support greater than the consolations of religion. But it was not his own but a quotation he gives from the talk of a bright woman. Conway tells this story as current about Emerson, though he does not pretend that it is true. Wishing to know Bowery life at its roughest, Emerson mussed his hat, turned up his coat collar, and going to the bar of a saloon called for a glass of grog. The barkeeper took a glance at his visitor, and said, "Lemonade will do for you." This must be classed with the legend that when Emerson visited Egypt the Sphinx said to him, "You're another!" Among

the traditions of Emerson is that one night in the small hours his wife was wakened by hearing him stir about the room. "Are you sick?" she asked anxiously. "No, only an idea." But Cabot spoils this story by saying, evidently with direct reference to it, that Emerson never got up at night, as some one has fancied, to jot down thoughts. In Boston a story is current which is well found, even if it is not true. A believer in the immediate second coming of Christ went about warning people that the end of the world was at hand. Emerson heard him serenely, and only said, "We can do without it." The Emerson legend is as good a place as any in which to put the Concord witticism about his relations with one of its philosophers. Emerson somewhere says that no one can easily be a good judge of his own admirers. Many of his friends thought there was no better exemplification of this than the, as it seemed to them, extravagant estimation in which he held this neighbor. They said this assimilating brother would repeat to Emerson on Tuesday the good things Emerson had said to him on Monday, and Emerson would marvel at the felicities of his inspired friend. The wits of Concord said that Emerson was a seer and his friend a seer-sucker.

Emerson styles himself a reporter merely, a suburban kind of man. He tried to see, he said, and to tell what he saw. To round a sentence or play the oracle was not possible to his integrity and sanity. In Arthur Hugh Clough's phrase, he "wholly declined roaring." When he speaks in the accents of the solemn, the grand, the beautiful, it is because his soul found itself in these deep waters. But if in the next moment the transition to comic or satiric came within, it would be given free speech, without. Wit shading down at one end of its spectrum to the merely comic brightens at the other into celestial radiations of wisdom too strong for laughter, as Wordsworth's thoughts were too deep for tears. From this sublimer wit came the illuminated vision with which Emerson saw and reported realities where others saw only mysteries, and mysteries where others thought they saw realities. Along his whole range from the essay on the "Oversoul" to that on the "Comic," this power of surprising the truth in front and rear is Emerson.

HENRY DEMAREST LLOYD.

WORK AND MORALITY.

THE moral quality which chiefly distinguishes the savage and the barbarian from the civilized man of the nineteenth century is violence of character. Man, as he appears in the anarchy of primitive life, and even a long time after he has begun to organize vaster and more complicated communities, is an extremely violent animal: his passions are extraordinarily excitable, dominating his will, and prompting him to acts of great violence. Grief, anger, love, covetousness, hate, easily rob him of all psychological equilibrium and rapidly put him into a state of transitory but fierce madness in which he loses all sense of right and wrong, and gives way to the violence of passion. The fundamental trait of his psychology is the blind impulsiveness of the carnivorous animal, which, upon the slightest provocation, attacks and bites its enemy. In fact almost all savage nations offer this psychological characteristic.

Herbert Spencer tells us that "early human nature differed from later human nature by having an extreme emotional variability," and that the trait of impulsiveness is to be looked for as fundamental among inferior races. Thus, to cite only a few instances, we find in North America the Snake Indian, who is said to be "a mere child, irritated by and pleased with a trifle." In Asia we find the Kamtschadales, of whom we read that they are "excitable, not to say hysterical; a light matter sets them mad or makes them commit suicide." Burchell describes the Hottentots as "passing from extreme laziness to extreme eagerness for action." Among the Negritos, the Papuan is impetuous, excitable, noisy; the Andamanese are all frightfully passionate and revengeful. The East African is at once very good-tempered and hard-hearted, combative and cautious; kind at one moment, cruel, pitiless, and violent at another; obstinate, fickle and fond of change, a lover of life though addicted to suicide.

But if the inferior savage races are so impulsive, it must not be supposed that men modify their characters as soon as communities begin to be organized and civilization becomes diffused: for a long time the history of civilization continued to be one of terrible acts of vio-

lence. Thus, from the fall of the Roman Empire until the beginning of the eighteenth century, throughout the barbaric periods, the reign of feudalism, and the great military monarchies, the customs of the whole of Europe bear the impress of such violence that we can hardly understand how men who differed but slightly from us, in point of culture, could possibly have lived in such a hell of fierce passions. In the barbaric communities which the Teutonic races founded upon the ruins of the Roman Empire, the philosophy of life seemed to be summed up in a strange motto of the poet Ragnar Lodbrog, which must strike us as madness but which at that period expressed a profound psychological truth,—“He who lives without wounds, grows weary of life.” In the council of Chalons, held A.D. 813, Bishop Jonas, a moralist, affirmed that the vices most common to that epoch, *i. e.*, the Carlovin-gian epoch, were vanity, pride, anger, and hate. At the courts of Charlemagne, of Louis the Pious, and of Henry the Confessor, the revels and banquets of the nobles often ended in fighting and massacre. At that time the word of Christ had lost its original meaning to such an extent that God’s ministers themselves set the example of violence, and in Paris, during the Middle Ages, the canons of Notre Dame engaged in the most sanguinary conflicts, arising from jealousy, with those of Sainte-Chapelle. The populace naturally followed their example; and on the day on which Louis XIII placed the kingdom under the protection of the Virgin Mary, the Parliament and the Chambre des Comptes came to blows amid great bloodshed in the cathedral of Notre Dame for the sake of the right of precedence in the procession. And the games which formed the pastime of the Parisian students were really battles, in which many of them were mortally wounded.

In Italy, Germany, and England the customs of that era were scarcely more moderate, although general culture and the fine arts were in a flourishing condition. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Florentine nobles used to take part in the insurrections of the town—often sanguinary battles in which many fell—to pass the time away and to procure themselves excitement, just as nowadays young men in society will arrange a shooting party. It was a rare thing, especially among the upper classes, to meet with a man who was innocent of blood; for two individuals—especially if they belonged to the aristocracy—happening to meet in the street were wont to quarrel and to endeavor to take each other’s life for the most insignificant act which might possibly be looked upon as provocative. This was not considered dishonorable, but only called for revenge on the part of the

murdered man's family ; and thus arose those terrible feuds between the great families which sometimes lasted for so many years. Cellini the great goldsmith, once killed a man in Paris in a fit of rage and yet, although this fact was well known, it did not injure him in the estimation of Francis I, neither did he himself consider it shameful, for he mentioned it calmly in his "Autobiography."

Neither the fear of punishment in this world nor the fear of torments in another could subdue this tumultuous violence of temperament. Lupold, bishop of Worms, whose recklessness provoked his brother to say, "My lord bishop, you scandalize us laymen greatly by your example ; before you were a bishop you feared God a little, but now you care nothing for him," replied to his brother that when they both should be in hell he would exchange seats if his brother desired. Richelieu issued the most severe edicts, forbidding duelling among the nobles under pain of death ; but in spite of this, groups of noblemen would engage in duels every day in the streets, which almost always ended in the death of one and often of both the combatants. It has been calculated that 30,000 persons were killed annually in duels in France at that period, and it has been said that duelling swept away even more of the nobles than war itself. In old Saxon poems one even reads of warriors who, at the advanced age of ninety, did not regret the acts of violence committed during their long life, but who complain of having to die in their beds, instead of on the battle-field.

Serenity and equanimity are on the other hand the fundamental characteristics of the civilized man of the nineteenth century. We are a race of reasonable beings, able to control our passions. According to our code of morals it is wrong to allow oneself to be led by passion to commit acts of violence, excepting in cases of some supremely noble passion, such as patriotism or maternal love. He who kills or wounds an enemy in a fit of anger, is to us a murderer, unworthy of pity. The principal streets of our cities contain exhibitions of priceless treasures, before which numbers of miserably poor people pass daily ; they may be covetous, yet it is very rare for any one of them to be so forcibly assailed by this feeling as to cause him to lose his self-control and to impel him to some act of violence against those accumulated riches. Nowadays men's minds are often excited to the highest pitch by political struggles ; yet it is very rare, even in moments of the greatest agitation, that there is any violence, except that of language. Ink flows instead of blood ; and terrible insults are exchanged, instead of blows. Violent acts are indeed committed now and then, but they inspire uni-

versal horror; for no other impulse of passion seems to us more shocking than that which causes man to use violence toward his fellows. We even look upon blows or a box on the ears, which were but playful jokes to the men of the olden days, as acts of violence, unworthy of respectable men, unless it is to defend a child or a woman. Thus, the majority of the inhabitants of towns leave their homes unarmed, because it is now very rare for a man to be attacked or involved in one of those violent and sanguinary disputes which formed an almost habitual pastime for the brave youths of the Middle Ages when taking a walk.

We are, in short, as compared with our ancestors, what a tamed dog is, as compared with a wild dog; for civilization is to man what taming is to animals. Hence there arises the problem, How and by what means has this taming process ensued, and why have so many millions of men thus radically changed their character?

The majority of men nowadays possess a peaceable character because they are accustomed to perform a certain amount of work daily in a methodical manner: the habit of regular and methodical work has destroyed the violent impulsiveness of man's primitive character. When man, as is the case to-day, has succeeded in subduing his natural propensity toward a life of idleness and pleasure, and in transforming himself into a living machine which continues day after day to perform the same work, the character becomes milder, less violent, and more controllable.

An every-day experience will help to explain this great psychological phenomenon,—one of the most important in history. Men who are in the habit of working very hard sigh for a short holiday; but when their wish is gratified, they find to their surprise that idleness fails to afford them the pleasure they had anticipated. They suffer especially from an unusual irritability, which causes them to be more easily roused to anger and to lose their habitual serenity. This increased irritability is nothing but a slight recrudescence of the violent impulsiveness inherent to human nature, a slight weakening of the power of self-control, which a simple interruption of regular work for a few days will suffice to produce even in firm and self-controlled characters. Let us suppose that, instead of an interruption of a few days, it is a question of uninterrupted idleness, of an almost entire absence of methodical work from childhood until old age, and it will easily be understood that this slight irritability will become aggravated until it develops into the violent impulsiveness peculiar to the savage and the barbarian. Another similar experience is that met with among the

working classes when out of employment during some crisis; then they grow so extraordinarily excitable that some slight incident is enough to incite them to frightful acts of violence. Certainly this is partly caused by the feeling of rage engendered by their long privations; but it is also partly derived from the natural impulsiveness of character being augmented by enforced idleness: it is a return to man's natural violence of character, which we are enabled to subdue only by subjecting ourselves to the law of continual work.

All savages, in fact, whose fundamental psychological characteristic is violent impulsiveness, are wandering hunters, fishermen, and gatherers of the spontaneous products of nature, *i. e.* they support themselves by intermittent work, such as hunting, fishing, and warfare, which sometimes require an intense effort of a very short duration, but not an effort of average intensity and of daily recurrence like the work of the modern man in the fields, in workshops, or in offices. From time to time, at irregular periods, they undertake some hunting expedition or they go to war; the rest of their time is passed in idleness, in sleep, in wandering about, or else in the indulgence of some unrestrained and violent exercise, such as dancing, which helps to demoralize their character to an even greater extent.

Hence the general violence of the customs in the Middle Ages must be especially attributed to the nobles, who were not engaged in any regular or methodical work. Enriched by the taxes extorted from their vassals and serfs, they passed their time in warlike enterprise, in hunting-expeditions, and mad, unbridled feasting; all these occupations being rather calculated to increase their innate violence and impulsiveness than to moderate it. On the other hand, the social customs became milder when society was governed by the middle classes;—by tradesmen obliged to pass the day in their shops; by clerks, condemned to seven or eight hours' daily work; by manufacturers, obliged to work incessantly in order to direct their workshops; by working men, subject to the law of daily toil lasting from sunrise to sunset. These men form—at least under ordinary circumstances—an immense body of reasonable and peaceable beings, with a well-balanced and self-controlled character—thanks to their habits of methodical work.

It will appear strange that methodical work should be thus able to admirably subdue the innate violence of human nature; but the phenomenon is easily explained when one considers that the primitive violent impulsiveness is the effect of an excess of unemployed mental energy which methodical work helps to use up. A fit of rage, or

any outburst of passion, gives rise to a waste of mental energy, the greater in proportion to the violence of the outbreak. Now when a man lives in idleness this mental energy accumulates in the nervous centres in great quantities and, finding no other vent, it escapes at the first provocation in the most intense outbreaks of passion. When, on the other hand, man works methodically, he uses up a great amount of nervous energy either in the accomplishment of his work, or in order to overcome the resistance of his attention and of his will, to which work is repugnant. His nervous centres are therefore in a continual state of exhaustion, they are continually expending energy, so that the quantity of mental energy necessary to produce violent outbreaks of passion is wanting. In fact work acts upon the mental energy accumulated in the brain in the same way as the lightning-conductor acts upon the electric energy accumulated in the clouds; it discharges it gradually, so that, not being accumulated in great quantities, it cannot suddenly flash forth. Work subdues man just because it tires him. The psychological process, when analyzed, does not much differ from that used by the Tartars when breaking-in horses: they tie the wild horse to a long rope and allow the animal to tire itself out with its violent efforts to free itself; when it has become exhausted and incapable of rebelling, they put on the saddle and bit.

A certain degree of self-control is the first condition of all morality: for of what avail are moral precepts when the character is the slave of passion and acts upon the spur of the moment? Therefore, the habit of methodical work is the basis of all ethics. There is so much truth in this, that, by one of the most wonderful phenomenon of atavism, the incapacity for work reappears in criminals and is perhaps one of the chief characteristics of their psychology.

The documentary evidence in support of this fact is abundant. Sichart, a German savant, found among 3,181 prisoners, 1,347 (42.3 per cent) who hated work, and who were classed as follows:

Of 1,848 thieves	961, or 52 per cent, hated work.
" 381 swindlers	172, " 45 " " " "
" 155 incendiaries	48, " 31 " " " "
" 542 sexual criminals	145, " 26 " " " "
" 255 perjurers	21, " 8.2 " " " "

Wright supplies us with valuable statistics with regard to criminals in the United States. In his interesting pamphlet "The Relation of Economic Conditions to the Causes of Crime," he says that of 4,340 convicts at one time in Massachusetts, 2,991, or 68 per cent, were re-

turned as having no occupation. The adult convicts numbered at that time 3,971; of these 464 were illiterate, and the warden of the State prison for the year in question stated that of 220 men sentenced during that year, 147 were without a trade or any regular means of earning a living. In Pennsylvania, during a recent year, nearly 88 per cent of the penitentiary convicts had never been apprenticed to any trade or occupation; and this was true also of 68½ per cent of the convicts sentenced to county jails and workhouses in the same State, during the same year. Further, in Mr. Frederic Wines's recent report on homicide in the United States in 1890, it is shown that of 6,958 men, 5,175, or more than 74 per cent of the whole, were said to have no trade. One is led to the same conclusion on examining the valuable reports of the Elmira Reformatory, which contain so many interesting criminological statistics. It appears from the "Twentieth Year Book of the New York State Reformatory at Elmira" that the 7,168 inmates were classed as follows with regard to their professions:

Servants and clerks.....	1,748	or	24.4	per cent.
Common laborers.....	4,001	"	55.9	" "
Mechanical workers.....	1,082	"	15.0	" "
Idlers.....	337	"	4.7	" "

It would thus seem as if the number of idlers was the smallest among the Elmira inmates, if it were not that the number of laborers is only apparent, according to the compilers of the book who add: "It should be stated that those who claimed some occupation were, as a rule, not regularly employed, nor steady, reliable workmen." This would seem to indicate that the real number of idlers considerably exceeds 4.7 per cent.

The researches of Marro are still more curious; he noticed among criminals a very strong tendency to change their profession,—a mutability which is a form of laziness. Thus, whereas in 100 normal cases he found 86 in which a single calling was followed, 13 in which the profession was once changed, and 1 case in which this happened three times; among many thousands of criminals, classed according to their offences, he found that the number of those who followed a single profession never amounted to 50 per cent. There were of the latter 43 per cent among thieves, 22 per cent among pickpockets and swindlers; 45 per cent among swindlers only. It is thus evident that criminals change their profession so frequently because, having but little desire to work, they hope thereby to lessen its irksomeness. For this reason I perfectly agree with Wright when he picturesquely affirms:—

“The idle man’s brain is the devil’s own workshop. . . . It cannot be claimed that any very desirable working material can be found among convicts. If we except the large number that are unable to work, we shall by no means find workers remaining. We shall find some with trades, able and ready to work, but the greater number lacking a self-supporting occupation and many unwilling to work. I believe that the unfitness for productive labor, whether it springs from lack of trade or occupation, or from personal antipathy to work, is a great and predisposing cause of both pauperism and crime.”

In short, the born murderer, the born thief, and swindler are criminals because they are incapable of adapting themselves to the uniformity and regularity of work, as it exists in our civilized nations; they would only be capable of supporting themselves by means of intermittent occupations, such as hunting and war, in which the work of primitive man can be summed up. On the one hand, incapacity for labor causes them to rebel against the great moral training of methodical work which subdues primitive impulsiveness; and, for this reason, they are impulsive beings, and no strong moral feeling is developed in them which might cause the sense of duty to curb the impulses of passion. On the other hand, possessing all the desires of modern men and being unable to satisfy them by means of work, they endeavor to do so by seeking the indirect paths of crime in order to enjoy without effort; hence, if on the one hand they sin from impulse, on the other they sin from necessity.

The capacity for work is such an important quality that I believe it influences not only crime but suicide. A great capacity for work is a safeguard against the temptation to commit suicide at the most painful moments of life. Those who have suffered much know that the worst pang of excessive grief is that one is not able to shake off the thought of one’s misfortune. The mind constantly recurs to it, overcome by a terrible obsession, incapable of attending to anything else, and forced to brood over its sorrow, until this painful contemplation slowly wears out all energy of will. In this state of mind work is repugnant, because it diverts one’s thoughts from the painful contemplation of one’s own grief; and yet work is the only means of saving a man from the depths of despair, because it frees the mind from painful ideas and relieves it from the self-torment caused by the ever-present image of misfortune. Even the strongest of men feel a distaste for work when suffering from some great sorrow; their mental energy and grief are struggling in their minds. If, however, their mental energy wins, if, in spite of their grief, they continue to work just as they did when they were happy, they will be able to set their minds at

rest and to lessen the obsession of the painful ideas which destroy the will-power and lead to extreme resolutions; they will run less risk of giving way to despair and they will be able, although they suffer very much, to await the consolation which will come to them in the course of time. On the contrary those who, possessing less mental energy, slacken their activity under the influence of grief, allow the latter to take possession of their mind and to eat away, like a cancer, all their force of will. I believe that those who commit suicide under the influence of sorrow are men who, in moments of grief, do not possess sufficient energy to continue to work as hard as usual; therefore they lack the principal means of escape from that obsession of the sad thoughts which destroys all moral energy and annihilates courage.

The capacity for methodical work is in short the very essence of morality, the quality upon which all others depend. Those who do not possess it may be able to partially make up for this defect by brilliant intellectual qualities, but they will always remain fundamentally imperfect individuals: those who possess this quality and do not endeavor to develop it by practice are dissipating the most precious treasure with which nature could endow them. It is true that Tolstoi recently maintained that work degrades and vilifies man; and when, in a conversation with him last year in Moscow on the subject of criminal psychology, I told him that the radical defect of criminals was laziness, he answered me: "But laziness is not a vice, it is a virtue." But we must only look upon this as a brilliant paradox of an eccentric mind which mingles the fundamental laws of human psychology with ingenious sophisms. If men were to live in idleness in order to meditate more freely upon the moral aims of life, they would at last grow weary of this meditation and would become irritable, impulsive, easily roused to violence; the amount of mental equilibrium that exists in the character of civilized man would be lost to make room for the continual want of balance noticeable in the savage and barbarian character; for it is only in very strong and lofty minds that such elevated and abstract meditation as that upon the moral aims of life could possibly maintain the equilibrium of character, just as the mechanical exercise of methodical work does nowadays for all men in our society. The capacity for methodical work is therefore the inheritance which a father ought most especially desire to transmit to his children and to see increased by a wise education; because it is the magic shield behind which a man can defend himself in the most terrible adversities of life.

WILLIAM FERRERO.

THE FUTURE OF SPELLING-REFORM.

THERE is now but one opinion among philologists concerning the existing English orthography, an opinion well expressed by Prof. Lounsbury in these words: "There is certainly nothing more contemptible than our present spelling, unless it be the reasons usually given for clinging to it." This spelling is also as much opposed to utility and common sense as it is to linguistic science; for it is easily shown to be a serious obstruction to education and to civilization, wasting and worse than wasting the time of our children in the schools, needlessly increasing the cost of all printed matter,—thus making the distribution of knowledge more costly,—and doing more than all other agencies combined to hinder the spread of English as the language of the commercial world by making most difficult its acquisition by the foreigner. In brief, no rational defense of it can, on any ground, be made.¹

The cause of spelling-reform, however, though admittedly reasonable and practical has not, it must be granted, made much progress in the most important direction, namely, in securing the general adoption of better spelling. It is, of course, possible to demand too much of human nature in a matter in which individual action is so difficult, and unreasonable to look upon slow progress as complete stagnation. It is easy also to overlook signs of actual progress; but, in fact, these appear in the unanimity of scholarly opinion, in the increasing sympathy of literary men and educators with the reform, in the recom-

¹ The only pleas still offered for it that seem worthy of refutation have been fittingly answered by many scholars, most forcibly perhaps by the late Prof. Whitney. "It need not be said," he remarks, "that the objections brought on etymological and literary and other grounds against the correction of English spelling are the unthinking expressions of ignorance and prejudice. All English etymologists are in favor of the correction of English spelling, both on etymological grounds and on the higher ground of the great service it will render to national education and international intercourse. It may safely be said that no competent scholar who has really examined the question has come, or could come, to a different conclusion."—"Century Dictionary," vol. VI, preface to list of amended spellings.

mendations of the American Association for the Advancement of Science with regard to the spelling of chemical names, in the spellings adopted by the Royal Geographical Society and the United States Board on Geographic Names, in the interest shown by various legislatures, and in the strong support which our American dictionaries, beginning with "The Century Dictionary," have brought to the amended spellings recommended by the English Philological Society and the American Philological Association. But when all is said that can be said on this side, it remains true that, in the essential matter of effecting a change in popular spelling, the reform has made almost no headway at all. What are the fundamental reasons for this state of affairs? And can it be changed? These seem to be the practical questions which now face the reformers.

It is obvious, at once, that it would be unreasonable to expect the reform to be carried into execution without the fulfilment of certain preliminary conditions, of which the most important are the education of public opinion and an agreement among the reformers upon a more or less definite plan of action. With general hostility or indifference on the part of the public and disagreement in the ranks of the reform, it would be absurd to look for practical results. Have these conditions, then, been complied with?

As regards education of public opinion an affirmative answer may, without much qualification, be given. The advance in this direction made during recent years is remarkable. It is true that one still hears from "intelligent men" uncomplimentary opinions of spelling-reformers, and that it cannot be said that all of the educated, perhaps not even the greater part, have been led to assent to the desirability of spelling-reform or even to perceive clearly what the discussion is about. But that aggressive prejudice, especially among literary men, which was so important not many years ago is a thing of the past. The public may, of course, be no nearer *adopting* the reform, but it undoubtedly has learned to treat it with respect and, if it does not positively favor it, at least hesitates to pass judgment upon it on theoretical grounds. While, therefore, it would be absurd to assert that the process of educating the public on the merits of the reform is completed, it may be said that the educational phase of the movement is over to this extent,—that if ignorance and prejudice were now the only obstacles in the way of a new orthography the public could certainly be brought to adopt one in a comparatively short time.

It is at the second point—that of agreement upon a plan—that pro-

gress has stopped and has, apparently, been completely blocked. It is therefore a matter of prime importance to the reformer to inquire exactly what are the difficulties that face him at this point.

The selection of a plan of reform involves two fundamental preliminary questions: What are the practical conditions which must determine the selection? and, Who is to make the choice? In answering these questions, it must constantly be kept in mind that the whole purpose of the reform is to reform. Its object is not, as some seem to suppose, to give an opportunity for the discussion of phonetics or the evolution of scientific alphabets, but to persuade people actually to improve the current spelling. However beautiful a scheme of reformed orthography for popular use may be, it is a total failure if the public will not accept it. In other words, the question before the reformer at this point is, *What, if anything, can the public, with a reasonable degree of probability, be brought to accept?* Discussion of the matter upon any other basis is worse than idle. Now there are two general kinds of reform, well described by Prof. Lounsbury as reform *of* the language and reform *in* the language, each of which is put forward, under various forms, by certain reformers as the one which the public should be asked to adopt. The former rests upon the more or less extensive reconstruction and enlargement of the alphabet, is pretty strictly phonetic, and would result in a radical transformation of the written language: for example, in the standard phonetic alphabet of the American Philological Association,—one of the least revolutionary,—*nowadays* would be spelled *nauadēz*. The latter would leave the alphabet alone, and would urge only more or less general simplifications of spelling within the lines of our present orthography, such as the omission of silent letters, the substitution of “f” for “ph,” as in *philosophy* (*filosofy*), and the like. Most of those who support the latter regard it, of course, as only a provisional scheme leading in time to a phonetic basis; but they regard it as the only immediately practicable one, while the advocates of the former believe that such halting methods are unnecessary.

It must, in fact, be conceded that the adoption by the public of any general, radical, phonetic system is one of the most improbable things that can be imagined. The reasons for this assertion are obvious and have often been stated, but their full significance has seldom, I think, been grasped by the radical reformer. They are practically all-powerful, but their force is underestimated by the phonetists because, from a scientific point of view, they are trivial and unworthy of consideration. The first is the closely-knit association, in all minds, between the form

of the printed word, or of the printed page, and the spiritual atmosphere which breathes through our language and literature. There is a deep-rooted feeling that the existing printed form is not only *a* symbol but the *most fitting* symbol of our mother tongue, and that a radical change in this symbol must inevitably impair *for us* the beauty and spiritual effectiveness of that which it symbolizes. Could the literary spirit even of a Shakespeare, we feel, retain for us undiminished its delicacy and power if clothed in the spelling of the "Fonetic Nūz"?

To the feeling thus expressed it is idle to reply that it is unreasonable and ridiculous, for this is not altogether true: it is really neither reasonable nor unreasonable, but non-reasonable, and it shares this character with most of the effective forces of human life, in art, ethics, and society. It is simply a sentiment that has grown up in us as all sentiments do, not by reasoning, but by a complex process of association and habit, and it has struck its roots deep down into the literary consciousness,—the deeper, perhaps, in proportion to the depth and richness of that consciousness. In other words, one may and easily can prove conclusively by theoretical, historical, and practical arguments that if we were *accustomed* to use and read the orthography of the "Fonetic Nūz," it would seem as beautiful to us as that which we now employ; but the fact remains that we are *not* accustomed to it and that upon custom, and upon that alone, depends our feeling, not our knowledge, of its fitness or unfitness. It is to be noted also that the character and power of this sentiment are not altogether expressions of mere literary association, but are also largely genuinely aesthetic. It is perfectly true that *nūz* or *niuz*, for example, when taken alone strikes the eye as pleasantly as *news*, and that to a foreigner or a child a phonetically printed page looks as well as a page of current English. But this does not negative the fact that to any mature English or American eye, habituated to English as it stands, phonetic spelling in the mass comes with exactly the same kind of shock that attends the sight of physical deformity. That is, it appears to be intrinsically ugly or grotesque, even to the phonetist himself; and the truth of this is shown by the facts that it has so often served as the staple of humor with such popular jokers as Josh Billings, and that so many of our dialect writers often use it in attempting to depict vulgar or dialectal speech. It is clear, then, that systematic phonetic reform has to meet, in the sentiment of the literary and æsthetic fitness of our present orthography, an obstructive force of great power, which is not, like mere ignorance or prejudice, to be destroyed by appeals to science

and reason, and which, indeed, is almost inaccessible to direct attack. So great, in fact, is its stubborn resistance that, even if it were the sole obstacle to radical reform, I should feel it to be simply preposterous to imagine that a great literary people like the English-American could, on any grounds of mere reason and practical utility, suddenly abandon its orthography for something radically different.

But there is another obstacle to the adoption of a phonetic system which is perhaps even greater and which is constantly underrated by the reformer, namely, simple inertia or laziness. The most serious fact with which a radical reform has to deal is that the generation which is asked to adopt it has already learned the old inconsistencies and irregularities, and learned them by an effort so painful that the mere suggestion of reversing the process and unlearning them, and then learning new forms, however simple, causes a genuine chill of despair not unmingled with indignation. For the average man—that is to say, ninety-nine out of every hundred—the existing spelling is a personal possession. He has bought it with a price, and a high one. It has become instinctive, except for an occasional reference to the dictionary. It is a tool which well serves all his ends, because he has adapted himself by long habit to its imperfections. What argument has the reformer capable of arousing him to the annoying and time-consuming, if not painful, effort to walk in the paths of phonetic rectitude? Will the arguments of the philologists avail? Will he be stirred by the appeal to help make the language a simpler and better tool for coming generations? Will he be moved to action by the fact that the public is annually losing some millions of dollars by the present system? Will he be profoundly agitated even by the loss of learning-time by his children and the woes of the foreign learner of the language? Verily, none of these things will move him. He will continue to say in the future, as he has said in the past, that he “appreciates the arguments adduced and regrets the loss entailed by the present system, but that the difficulties involved in making the change prevent him from joining the movement, which really should be carried out by the younger generation for whom these difficulties are not so great.” And so, farewell!—for the younger generation can have practically nothing to do with the matter and the reform must be accomplished, if at all, by the cooperation of grown-up people like him.

Another difficulty in the way of a radical change—apparently, perhaps, trivial, but in reality most serious—is that of making a beginning, of getting something actually adopted. Some enthusiasts seem to

suppose that the public in convention assembled will vote to adopt the phonetic system presented, say by the Philological Association, and then give notice that on and after a certain day all newspapers, school-books, and other publications must conform to the standard thus established! On the contrary the public as such not only would never take the initiative, but would be apt to resent dictation from any source. It would at most follow timidly and haltingly some leader whose example would have great weight with it. Who shall this leader be? Shall we look to the Government, and State legislatures? Their influence would be very great, especially through the publications and the schools under their control; but recent experiences with them do not give the reformer any strong hope that they will act the part of leader. To the scientific associations? Their popular influence is not sufficient. To philologists and spelling-reformers? They have hardly any control of the public at all. To literary men? They cannot afford to take the financial risk of being peculiar. In short, we must accept as true the dictum of Dr. William T. Harris, an earnest reformer, "that the selection and adoption of a phonetic alphabet is impossible by any agency known to English-speaking people." It is needless to dwell upon the other practical difficulties,—the inevitable chaos of a transition period, the immense loss of invested capital, the cost of providing new dictionaries, school-books, new editions of the classics, and so on. Though important, these are all secondary.

It appears, then, from these facts that the one who will decide what kind of reform is to be adopted is not the phonetist, but the public; and that the decision will be determined, not by conscious deliberation and election, but by that unconquerable disinclination to any radical change which eliminates all "reform of the language" from the list of possibilities. If it ever comes, it can come only as the last stage of a long process. Reform in the language is therefore the only reform that deserves consideration. This conclusion is, of course, not pleasing to the extreme phonetists. They appear to think that it is only necessary for them to agree among themselves upon the details of an ideal reform, and then to lead the public, like willing sheep, into the sweet pastures of scientific spelling! The simple fact, however, is that in this course the extremists step entirely outside their province and do the precise thing which has led the public to regard all spelling-reformers as "cranks," thus greatly hindering, instead of helping, the cause they have at heart.

How then, it will be asked, about the possibility of even this re-

form "*in* the language"? Will not these practical obstacles retard useful change in this direction as in any other? Is the future of spelling-reform likely to be any different from its present and past?

It is, I think, obvious that the outlook for the second kind of reform must be very much more promising than the outlook for the first. No doubt it seems at first almost as difficult to secure the adoption of simplifications, even as moderate as those recommended by the philological societies,¹ as to establish a phonetic system; but this is not true of their gradual introduction. A phonetic system must be taken at once and once for all: mere simplifications may be adopted one by one and the process extended over an indefinite period of years. What an enormous difference this makes is obvious from the simple consideration that all the obstacles to reform which I have noted rest mainly upon absolutely nothing but habit, inveterate to be sure and unassailable directly, but still open to gradual correction and, finally, to complete change, as all habit is. Habits are lines of least resistance, and it is always possible so to vary the resistance at different points that the lines can be modified very much at will. But such modifications can never, in well-established habits, be secured except very gradually; at least the sudden conversions which we regard, even in the individual, as manifestations of Divine power, never occur in communities and great masses of men. The wise man who seeks to secure a reform does not rush at the habit he is attacking and attempt to pull it up at once, root and branch. He rather seeks to find in the person or society he is reforming the elements of an opposite or better habit, and to knit them together and strengthen them until they have sufficient power to prevail.

Just this exactly appears to be the only possible and hopeful course for the spelling-reformer. While it is mere childishness to assume that deep-rooted habits of the public can suddenly be torn up and the phonetic habit planted in their place, it is highly reasonable to assume that these habits will ultimately yield to a well-directed attack of the kind described. No habit is absolute, but about each there is a fringe of thoughts, feelings, and conduct which does not exactly harmonize with it; the drunkard is not always drunk or desirous of being so, nor is the thief always willing to steal: and in the same way it will be found that even the most stubborn sticklers for the "authorized" orthography have a few words which they would not regret to see

¹ See the appendices to "The Century Dictionary," the "International Dictionary," and the allowed spellings in "A Standard Dictionary."

changed, and that even those who are least inclined to make the effort to relearn their spelling find it convenient to use a few of the simplified forms which the dictionaries now allow. In brief, there are, in the variations of our existing orthography allowed by the dictionaries and in the occasional innovations of influential writers which are accepted by the public without any jarring of the nerves, the beginnings of a movement which, if continued along its own lines and gradually pushed to a consistent conclusion, will result in a vast simplification and rationalizing of our language.

This very process, though not always well directed has been going on for three centuries. Why not, then, fasten upon these beginnings, make them clear to the public, stimulate their use, add to them gradually as the sense of their oddness wears off and the appreciation of their utility increases, and thus in the course of years slowly eliminate at least all the gross absurdities from our written speech? Is it not entirely conceivable that, by this steady process of transformation, the sentiment which now clings to the existing orthography will gradually disappear or become attached to the newer forms? And is it not certain that the opposition of inertia and laziness, and of the other practical hindrances mentioned, will be entirely disarmed? This, at least, seems now to be the conviction of most of the wisest of the reformers.

And so, the extremist will exclaim, you will abandon scientific precision and a correct system for a mere patching of the scientifically unpatchable! Perhaps they will only be postponed; but if they are really abandoned, what then? I can only reply once more that the adoption of the reform is wholly a practical matter, something that concerns the general public and it alone. The phonetists have their scientific alphabets and can have as many more as they may care to devise; the use of any of these by the public will not help their science a particle: why then should they insist on cramming them down the public throat, when the public stomach will not tolerate them?

Of the details of this practicable reform and of the methods by which it can be promoted, there is not space here to speak. It is enough to say that the essence of it lies in persuading those who are favorably disposed, on theoretical grounds, to the amending of English spelling, to use in their publications and correspondence, so far as they can, the simpler forms which have the support of any good authority and are most in accord with existing analogies and the historic and philological standard, thus gradually habituating the public to better ways.

This is done to some extent now; but the practice should and could vastly be extended. In the list of spellings above mentioned recommended by the philological societies, as well as by all the editors of well-known English dictionaries, one has a guide that can safely be followed. The objections brought against it, namely, that it is partial, reforming some words and leaving unreformed others equally bad; that the principles upon which it is constructed are not consistently applied; and that to adopt it would be to introduce a new element of confusion into the language—would, to a large extent, be valid if it were put forward as the limit of the reform. This, however, is not its character. It is simply a preparatory guide for those who are willing to take one or more of the initial steps of the reform. Its negative imperfections are therefore of little consequence; its merit lies in the fact that its use will infallibly tend toward a simple and practically-consistent orthography.

The feeling, however, that the success of the movement depends entirely upon getting a very large number of people to agree to make a small beginning, and that its final speed will be in proportion to its initial slowness, has led the more intelligent reformers to recommend the immediate adoption of much more restricted changes. Rules for these smaller beginnings are furnished by the Spelling-Reform Association and others. The most conservative action is that of the Orthographic Union,¹ which aims to gain wide acceptance for a few useful simplifications, and then to extend them as fast as may be possible. In its list of vice-presidents are the names of William Dean Howells, Edward Eggleston, Brander Matthews, Thomas R. Lounsbury, Andrew D. White, William R. Harper, Francis A. March, William Hayes Ward, Charles P. G. Scott, and others—names which show that literature, as well as linguistic science, is back of the movement.

Is it unreasonable, then, to urge all who are working for the cause to continue their phonetic studies as matters of pure science and theory, and to concentrate their practical efforts upon driving in the thin edge of the wedge which these gentlemen and others think that they can insert into the gnarled block of habit from which the axe of the phonetist constantly rebounds?

BENJAMIN E. SMITH.

¹ Founded at New York in June, 1895.

ANOTHER PHASE OF THE NEW EDUCATION.

THE city of Detroit, Michigan, maintains in connection with its public-school system a Normal Training School for teachers, which is in this country unique. The idea upon which it rests,—that of the “culture-epochs” in education,—first definitely promulgated by Ziller and later practicalized by Dr. Rein of the Jena Pedagogical Seminary, is one, however, by no means unfamiliar to students in the theory of education. Just now, indeed, in the revival of interest in pedagogics throughout this country, the culture-epoch principle is receiving perhaps the lion’s share of attention. In brief it may be stated as follows: Every child repeats in his own development the history of the race; therefore his education should follow, as closely as may be, the lines of progress drawn by the civilization of the race.

Miss Scott, the head of the Detroit Normal School, is, however, not an orthodox Herbartian, and deviates in many important particulars from the systems employed in the German culture-epoch schools; but since these deviations are of interest rather to the student of technical pedagogy than to the general reader, they need not here be specified. It will be sufficient to say, by way of a general characterization of the Detroit plan, that a certain period in the history of world-civilization, studied in all its aspects and relations, constitutes the central core or nucleus for the work of a given grade, from this differentiating all the various branches of study—the history (political, industrial, social, and religious), the literature and language, the art, the ethics, the natural science, the number or arithmetic, the drawing, and music.

All this sounds very ambitious. Perhaps it would be well to see what is actually done to this end in the Detroit school. The system has been in operation for the past four years, under Miss Scott’s direction, in one of the regular ward schools of the city, and, though viewed simply as an experiment, it challenges attention, whatever may be one’s judgment as to the philosophic soundness of the culture-epoch theory. That an actual though very elastic correspondence does exist between the development of the child’s mind during the school period and a succession of phases in the history of civilization, Miss Scott believes

she has demonstrated in her study of the children under her charge. And it is this study which has determined the system, both as to its general plan and in all details.

The general plan is perhaps most easily learned upon a visit to the Washington Building, in which the Training School has its headquarters. It is a typical city school-building of dingy red brick, three stories high, its elbows knocking against the fences on each side, and set down in the midst of a German, Russian, and Polish settlement, with a thin sprinkling of Americans and Africans—surely as unpromising a field as could be selected for an experiment of this kind.

In the first grade, the children between five and six years old are deep in stories of *Hiawatha*, the little Indian boy, a type of the nomadic period in civilization. Every day the teacher tells them a story, either new or old, about *Hiawatha*,—how he looked, what sort of house he lived in, what he ate and what he wore, what he learned in his forest school, how he shot the deer, how he made his canoe, about the animals and flowers he knew, and, with the particularity so dear to the childish heart, almost everything relating to his daily life. These stories are very simple, consisting often of not more than half a dozen sentences. For instance, on the first morning I visited the school the story told how *Hiawatha* all alone walked proudly into the forest with the bow and arrows which the old Iagoo had made for him (the stories of the making of the bow and arrows and of what the birds and the squirrel said to *Hiawatha* had been used, in order, before), and how the rabbit leaped out of his pathway, saying to the little hunter, "Do not shoot me, *Hiawatha*!"

When the story had been told with delightful minuteness and enthusiasm by the teacher, she drew the main facts from the children again by means of questions, and then one child, who had among others volunteered, was selected to tell the whole story, the order of events, as narrated by the teacher, being carefully maintained. The reading-lesson followed: it had previously been placed upon the blackboard in script letters and consisted of the lines—

" And the rabbit from his pathway
Leaped aside;
Saying to the little hunter,
' Do not shoot me, *Hiawatha* !'"

The method by which children in the first grade learn to read such a lesson as this may be sufficiently suggestive to the teacher to warrant a brief description. The children read what is set for them largely

through their previous knowledge of the story which it tells, and of the order of events therein; but, having read it after this fashion, they learn to pick out any given line—such as, “Do not shoot me, Hiawatha!”—from the rest; at first from their knowledge of the order of events, and afterward from their familiarity with the general appearance of each verse in whatever position on the blackboard it may be found. Next, by a similar process, they learn to recognize at sight any given word anywhere in any of the verses, and, later, also when isolated on the blackboard. From the identification of words, the child descends to letters, as in the old “word-method,” and learns “a” and “b” only after he has long been able to pick out the word “rabbit” under any disguise of unfamiliar association in script or writing, and to read fluently such a passage from “Hiawatha” as that above cited. After the reading-lesson, the pupils in this class retire to their seats, each to make “three rabbits” from a box of pasteboard letters, and then to model a more or less lumpy, but sometimes quite effective, bunny in soft clay.

Meanwhile another class has a story-lesson about the different pairs of things the rabbit has—eyes, ears, jaws, hind-feet, fore-feet, etc. They crowd with absorbing interest round a large photograph of Titian’s “Madonna of the Rabbit,” and, taking their seats, each proceeds to cut out of paper a small copy of the famous bunny, drawn for that purpose by the teacher. About the room are clay models and drawings made by the children, illustrating the study in all lines up to date; bows and arrows made “like *Hiawatha’s*”; a doll dressed by the children as a regular Indian brave, according to the description given of *Hiawatha’s* dress in the poem. Another doll was dressed to represent a modern American boy, but was not half so fine or wonderful in the children’s eyes. Upon the walls hung animal and Indian pictures; and one side of the blackboard was covered with very skilful drawings made by the teacher to illustrate the life and exploits of *Hiawatha*. “What is it that you try to do for the children in this room?” I asked the teacher. “To encourage their natural curiosity about all the facts or phenomena that come under their notice, to teach them to reproduce their observations truthfully, to feel a kinship with all animal and plant life, to be brave (not foolhardy) and uncomplaining—this, of course, in addition to the ordinary studies,” she replied. “*Hiawatha* is their hero, and they want to be just like him in every particular, so that gives them an incentive in these directions.”

The next room was devoted to *Kablu*, a little early Aryan boy, who, as I learned from the stories told by the children, lived in a one-story

log house, built against the side of a tall rock, and tended his father's sheep on the mountain-sides. He got up before sunrise every morning to stand, with the rest of the family, around a big flat stone upon which his father kindled a fire, by rubbing two dry sticks together, and over which he offered a prayer to the great Sun as he rose. The children light a fire in this way themselves. They build a house like *Kablu's*, and make clay dishes like his. They study about the sheep he tended, and make clothes, such as he wore, for a little Aryan doll. The idea of the home is emphasized in this grade, and pictures of the Holy Family are everywhere upon the walls. The teacher explained to me that these pictures were used with no religious or sectarian implications: they stand simply for beautiful pictures of family life. The children certainly seemed to be very fond of them. I noticed several at different times look up from their work to the picture nearest them on the wall with an expression of content and appreciation, such as the faces of few grown people exhibit when set before a famous picture. The story of "Little Lord Fauntleroy" is used in this grade, for its ideal family life and affection, and the children dress a Fauntleroy doll to play with the Kablu doll, thus emphasizing the difference between the clothing of *Kablu's* time and of ours. They measure carefully every part of every garment made, and find many of their number-lessons in the process of doll-dressing. As in the *Hiawatha* room they enjoyed many of the Indian legends, here they revel in the myths of the early Aryan period—"Red Riding-Hood," "Cinderella," "Jack and the Beanstalk," "Jack the Giant-Killer," "Sleeping Beauty," etc. Out of some of these grows much of the nature-work for the grade; out of "Sleeping Beauty," for instance, is developed the study of seed-life, cocoons, etc.

In this room the children are shepherds and farmers, as in the *Hiawatha* room they were hunters; and the nature-work, as before, is an outgrowth of the life of the period. In this same room, later in the year, the children become soldiers, with Darius, the Persian boy; building the city of Babylon with bricks they themselves have made, growing familiar with Persian art in its characteristic colors and outlines, expert in military exercises, and imbued with the military spirit of "Truth, Courage, and Obedience," which three words constitute the motto for the room. Through the contact of the Hebrews with the Persians opportunity is given for a study of Hebrew civilization in its broad outlines, and the ideals of the period are strengthened by the use of Old Testament stories exemplifying them. The fruits and flowers native to Persia and familiar also to us are used for nature-study.

In the next room the scene had shifted to Greece. About the walls hung representative specimens of Greek art, in photographs, bas-reliefs, and statuettes. The Apollo Belvedere, the Venus of Milo, Diana, Mercury, Hebe, the Sleeping Ariadne, Aurora, Clytie, Niobe, and many others embodied concretely the motto on the board, "The True, the Good, and the Beautiful." As I came in, a little boy, perhaps eight years old, was telling the story of Baucis and Philemon with exquisite clearness and precision of phrase, and then another related the story of Rhœcus, and the children "acted it out," a little girl taking the part of the dryad, a boy that of Rhœcus, another that of the bee, while three or four boys acted the rôle of the playmates of Rhœcus. This "acting out" I found to be a favorite means all through the school for representing the stories told. The children take any parts, inanimate and non-sentient as well as human. In fact, the nature-work is very commonly reproduced in this fashion. The Greek doll and Greek house, as well as a Greek temple, built by the children, represented some of the hand-work in this room. Greek words were written upon the blackboard (in Greek characters) to show how Cleon wrote; illustrations of scenes from the "Iliad" and "Odyssey," the characteristic Greek border, and sketches of the flowers, leaves, and insects especially beloved of the Greeks, also adorned the blackboard. There was room, however, in one corner for the following problem: "Cleon began to go to school when he was five years old, which was the third year of the seventy-fifth Olympiad. How old was Cleon at the seventy-seventh Olympiad?" Other problems dealt with the proportion of dimensions in the columns and other parts of the temple the children had built, its floor-space, and the proportion of features in certain Greek statues. I found that "proportion" is the general subject for the number-work in this room.

Across the hall was the Roman room. Photographs from busts of Cæsar, Cicero, and the young Augustus, of Roman temples, arches, and colonnades, strike one's attention upon the instant of entering. Horatius is the name of the Roman boy who is used as the type-character for this grade, and Macaulay's "Horatius," narratives of other old Roman heroes, such as Regulus, Curtius, and Cincinnatus, and the story of the "Æneid," form the literary background for the work of the grade. "Power through law" is the ethical core of the study; and the atmosphere seems full of the stern integrity and self-control for which the word "Roman" stands to us. The military and patriotic spirit is strong here, and the stories of heroism past and present are told by the

children with a fervor which indicates fundamental sympathy with the spirit expressed in them. Roman life is reproduced, so far as may be, in all the various phases of its expression,—the home, the school, industrial and social life, the state, and the church.

It was difficult, in passing to the next room, to shake from my feet all the dust of Rome ; but, in five minutes after entering the realm of feudalism and chivalry, I had forgotten everything but the scene before me. A dozen children were gathered about a relief-map in clay, which they had just finished, representing the scene of King Arthur's death,—that "dark strait of barren land," where stood the ruined chapel with its broken cross, the mountains and the sea on one hand, and the lake on the other, to which from the chapel ran the zigzag path which Sir Bedivere three times traversed to cast away King Arthur's sword. Having finished the scene to their satisfaction, one eight-year-old girl took a book and read to the others the story as Tennyson has it in "Morte d'Arthur." There was hardly a breath or a stir among the children as she read, with evidently ardent appreciation ; and when the teacher at last stopped her, a boy took up the story at that point and carried it on with apparently equal enjoyment. In telling the story, later, I noticed that the archaisms were almost invariably used in preference to the modern, more prosaic terms ; not at all because the children did not know the latter as equivalent to the former,—for in every instance the one was given promptly for the other when the teacher called for such an interchange,—but, evidently, there was an undefined feeling of the greater congruity of the archaic tone-colors with the atmosphere of the story. "Then King Arthur said : " related a small boy enthusiastically, "I am so deeply smitten through the helm"—"What do you mean by 'smitten through the helm' ? " interrupted the teacher. "Hit in the head," responded the child with almost resentful promptness ; but it was a minute or two before he got completely back again into the witchery of the chivalric story. Prominent upon the blackboard in this room were set the lines :—

" Who revered his conscience as his King ;
Whose glory was, redressing human wrong ;
Who spake no slander, no, nor listen'd to it."

and

" My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure."

From chivalric days I entered upon the high-pressure age of the

Renaissance, with Columbus as its central figure. As this period marks the revival of painting, the walls of the schoolroom were rich with photographs of the masterpieces of Michelangelo, Raphael, da Vinci, Correggio, Guido Reni, and others. The children in this grade read selections from the best literature in regard to Columbus, Copernicus, Raleigh, and Joan of Arc, as representatives of the period. They become familiar with the story of Spenser's "*Faerie Queene*," of some of Shakespeare's plays, and of Dante's "*Divine Comedy*." This is the ship-building period and the cathedral period, and the renaissance of music as well as art, of speculation and experiment in every line, of enthusiasm for learning; and I should not be at all surprised to find that this grade is the place in which a majority of the children definitely decide to enter the High School. At all events, whether this grade be the determining point or not, it is a fact that the mid-year "graduating" class from the eighth grade of the Washington School in February, 1896, returned twenty of its twenty-one members to the entering class of the High School—a record not often paralleled in city schools.

The first half-year in the fourth grade is devoted to the Puritans, in England, in Holland, and in America. Cromwell, Hampden, Milton, Bunyan, William of Orange, and Miles Standish are the heroes of the children in this room; "*Pilgrim's Progress*," "*Paradise Lost*" (selections), "*Rise and Fall of the Dutch Republic*" (selections), and Longfellow's "*Courtship of Miles Standish*" are their classics. The atmosphere of the room, and the spirit of the work I saw there, would indicate as appropriate some such motto as this: "A conscience free and responsible." I did not see this motto written anywhere in the room, but its spirit was so manifest that I asked in all sincerity of Miss Scott—"Have you created this sturdy sobriety in the children by imposing upon them the Puritan conception of life?" Her reply may be noted as suggestive of the genesis of her plans: "There would never have been any Puritan grade, had I not observed a Puritan period in the children themselves. Of course not all children experience it, but I may say that the majority, especially if guided through the restless multiplicity of life in the Renaissance period, are compelled by the very constitution of their minds somehow to unify it all; to find one sure principle of action underlying and focusing their experiences, to which they may give undivided allegiance. And this principle, whatever it may be, must be their own—the freedom of the Renaissance period has left them this inheritance—and it must be dominant in their lives. We find this true of most children who have really lived the

Renaissance period. And we are simply trying to help them to live this period also, in order that it may give place to another, more highly developed. I believe many of the children in this grade are already upon an ethical plane higher than that of the Puritans, for most of them recognize consciously the duty not alone of obeying, but also of enlightening, the conscience."

I had time only for a glance at the rooms beyond this grade; but found the history of our country—political, industrial, and social—traced, first as a whole, next in sections, and finally as related to the development in all these lines of the various grand divisions of the earth. The history of the world's progress as a whole was then summarized for the purpose of disclosing the principle of coöperation, which has been more or less explicitly recognized throughout the grades as the underlying principle, not only of political but also of industrial and social development. Upon this basis a study of sociology is pursued in the eighth grade. In the first half-year, the state is the special subject for study, its ethical core being the idea of justice, as a necessary outgrowth of the intertwining of the individual with the coöperative social structure. The formal side of this study is commonly taught under the head of "Civil Government." The meaning of these forms becomes intelligible in connection with the generalizations previously made; and the thought of justice is elaborated in a somewhat detailed study of the "Divine Comedy." I will own that I felt the ground somewhat "wobbly" under my feet, as I listened to the astounding statement that children in the eighth grade were studying the "Divine Comedy." The conjunction of a kindergarten infant with the "Odyssey" would have been hardly more startling. But the class was already in session; so I choked down my incredulity, and entered. The teacher, a lithe, bright-faced little woman, with a fund of rare idealism savingly tinctured with common sense, was telling the boys—the same lesson having previously been presented to the girls—the story of Dante's visit to the seventh terrace of the Purgatorio, where the animal passions were burned away. I must say that I have never heard a story told better, more delicately and deftly, with juster emphasis, more fidelity to the spirit of the original, or a more inspiring touch. The children listened almost reverently and, being questioned, related the essential points in the story with an exactness which showed the concentration of their attention. Then one of the boys told the story with spirit and precision, and the class was directed to write it out in narrative form for the next day's lesson.

In the second half-year the central idea is love, instead of justice, and the social institution is the family, not, as before, the state. The family is studied as a coöperative unit, and the fact of love and family relationship is frankly recognized as the highest spiritual coöperation. Love-stories of the pure sort are read and told in class,—“Paul and Virginia,” for instance, “Evangeline,” “The Tempest,” and one or two others,—with an attempt to preserve and even increase the sacredness of the family relation in the minds of the children. Thus the real interest in the subject which is natural to their period of development is directed into healthful and normal channels, instead of being, as is quite generally the case, simply ignored by both teachers and parents, so that the children are left an easy prey to shallowing and vulgarizing influences from without.

“What is to be the end of this work of yours?” I asked of Miss Scott.

“I hope there won’t be any end,” she replied. “But this much is sure, it is hardly begun yet. We are feeling our way along, holding tightly to the children, and not moving a step until they have given the initiative. This is our only safe course. We alter the work every year, and shall abandon the fundamental principle altogether, if further investigations into child-development should at any time overthrow the conclusions already reached. I dislike to call my plan a ‘system’ at all, for the word seems to imply something fixed and definitive, whereas this is as yet in the germ. I believe it is all there, but much is yet very inadequately developed. We cover the same ground in technical reading, writing, drawing, science-study, number, geography, and language, as that occupied by the old system, and in fact much more, besides our important work in literature, art, and ethics. But there is still very much to be done in all these departments.”

“I don’t know which to call this,” I appealed,—“the apotheosis of the story, or a gigantic philosophy of coöperation.”

“Either will do,” she responded; “coöperation is the idea, and the story is our method.”

GERTRUDE BUCK.